arXiv:1403.5800v1 [math.AT] 23 Mar 2014

Perverse sheaves over real hyperplane arrangements

Mikhail Kapranov Vadim Schechtman

March 25, 2014

Contents

0 Introduction. **2**

1 Generalities. **6**

2 Background on real arrangements and the three stratifications **13**

3 Constructible complexes on arrangements **19**

4 Perverse sheaves and double quivers **27**

5 Functorialities of the double quiver **33**

6 The double quiver determines a perverse sheaf **36**

7 Algebraic relations in the double quiver **40**

8 Equivalence of categories **46**

9 Examples and complements **55**

0 Introduction.

(0.1) Let X be a smooth complex algebraic variety and $\mathcal{X} = (X_\alpha)$ be a complex algebraic Whitney stratification of X. Fix a base field $\mathbf{k}$. One has then an abelian category $\mathrm{Perv}(X, \mathcal{X})$ of $\mathcal{X}$-smooth perverse sheaves of $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces on X, see [2, 23]. Understanding this category is one of the central problems of topology of algebraic varieties. In many applications it is important to have an explicit description of $\mathrm{Perv}(X, \mathcal{X})$ as the category of $\mathbf{k}$-representations of some quiver with relations. General microlocal methods [1, 27, 17] provide a way to approach such a description in principle: an object $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(X, \mathcal{X})$ gives rise, for each α, to a "local system of Morse data" $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ on some open part of the conormal bundle $T^*_{X_\alpha} X$, and the strategy is then to try to glue the categories formed by the $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ into a single abelian category by an inductive procedure, adding one stratum at a time. However, there are only a very few higher-dimensional examples where a complete description has been obtained: normal crossings [14], Grassmannians with the Schubert stratification [6], rectangular matrices with the rank stratification [8].

(0.2) In this paper we consider the case when $X = \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is given by an arrangement $\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{C}$ of linear hyperplanes in X with real equations (so $\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{C}$ is the complexification of an arrangement $\mathcal{H}$ of hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^n$). We denote the corresponding category $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ and give a complete, combinatorial description of it in terms of the following data:

(1) The poset (partially ordered set) $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$ of *faces*, i.e., convex locally closed subsets of all dimensions into which $\mathcal{H}$ stratifies $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(2) The concept of *collinearity*. We call an ordered triple of three faces (A, B, C) collinear if there are points $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$ such that b lies in the straight line segment $[a, c]$.

Here the order is important. For example, a triple (A, A, B) is always collinear, whereas (A, B, A) is not if $B \neq A$.

Note that these data can be recovered from the *oriented matroid* associated to $\mathcal{H}$, see [4]. See also (0.5) below.

Let us denote by $\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ the category formed by *double representations* of $\mathcal{C}$, i.e., of diagrams consisting of finite-dimensional $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces $E_C, C \in \mathcal{C}$ and linear operators

$$\gamma_{C'C} : E_{C'} \longrightarrow E_C, \;\; \delta_{CC'} : E_C \longrightarrow E_{C'}, \;\; C' \leq C,$$

such that the $\gamma_{C'C}$ form a representation of $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$, and the $\delta_{CC'}$ form a representation of the opposite poset $(\mathcal{C}, \geq)$, in $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces. Our main result, Theorem 8.1, is that $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ is equivalent to the full subcategory in $\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ consisting of representations satisfying the following three conditions:

Monotonicity: *For any $C' \leq C$ we have $\delta_{CC'}\gamma_{C'C} = \mathrm{Id}_{E_C}$.*

This allows us to define, for any $A, B \in \mathbb{C}$, the transition map

$$\phi_{AB} = \gamma_{CB}\delta_{AC} : E_A \longrightarrow E_B,$$

where C is any cell $\leq A, B$. For example, $\phi_{AA} = \mathrm{Id}_{E_A}$.

Transitivity: *If (A, B, C) is a collinear triple of faces, then $\phi_{AC} = \phi_{BC}\phi_{AB}$.*

Note that this relation does *not* imply that $\phi_{AB}\phi_{BA} = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathrm{E_A}}$.

Invertibility: *If C_1, C_2 are faces of the same dimension d, lying in the same d-dimensional subspace, on the opposite sides of a $(d-1)$-dimensional face D, then $\phi_{C_1C_2}$ is an isomorphism.*

Let $L \subset X$ be *a flat*, i.e. an intersection of some hypeplanes from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$, of dimension d. The last two conditions mean that the spaces E_C and the maps $\phi_{CC'}$ where C, C' run through all d-dimensional faces inside L, form a local system over $L^o = L \setminus \cup_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}} H$.

(0.3) The type of description of $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ that we obtain, is quite different from those appearing in most of the earlier approaches. More precisely:

(a) It is of *monomial nature*: the conditions on the maps $\gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'}$ do not appeal to the operations of addition or multiplication by scalars, but only to composition of maps. For comparison, in the most classical case of $X = \mathbb{C}$ stratified by $\{0\}$ and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, the standard description [1, 14] is in terms of diagrams $\{\Phi \underset{u}{\overset{v}{\rightleftarrows}} \Psi\}$ such that $\mathrm{Id}_\Psi + vu$ is invertible, so it is not monomial. (See §9 for the comparison of the two descriptions in this case). Note that with a monomial description one has the means to define what should be a *"perverse sheaf of sets"*, or a *"perverse stack of categories"* on $\mathbb{C}^n$ smooth with respect to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

(b) From the point of view of the local systems $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ above, the fundamental objects for us are not monodromies corresponding to closed loops, but *half-monodromies* corresponding to paths joining neighboring cells and going

around the wall in the complex domain (the maps $\phi_{C_1C_2}$ in the transitivity condition are examples of such half-monodromies).

It is a known phenomenon in the theory of quantum groups that a typical monodromy matrix M of the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equation has quite complicated matrix elements, whereas the two half-monodromies M_+ and M_- of which it is composed via $M = M_+M_-$, are of much simpler (monomial) nature, cf. [34]

(c) From the purely topological point of view, our approach emphasizes not the fundamental groups but the *fundamental groupoids* of the complex strata, with as many base points as there are different faces in the same stratum. The simpler nature of relations is achieved therefore by introducing a certain redundancy in our description: to each complex stratum we associate not a single vector space (as in the standard approaches) but several isomorphic spaces E_C corresponding to different cells C in the stratum. Our approach can thus be seen as a natural developments of the work of Salvetti [31], Gelfand-Rybnikov [16] and Björner-Ziegler [5] who studied the topology of complexified arrangements by real methods and formulated the results in terms of oriented matroids.

(d) The spaces E_C appearing in our description, are not the fibers of the local systems $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ (as in most of the standard approaches) but, rather, can be identified, non-canonically, with direct sums of several such fibers. This can be surmised already from the monotonicity condition which implies $\dim(E_{C'} \geq \dim(E_C)$ for $C' \leq C$. In particular, the "biggest" space E_0 has the dimension equal to the sum of the ranks of all the local systems, corresponding to all the strata. In our approach, E_0 can be identified with the *space of hyperfunction solutions* of the holonomic $\mathcal{D}$-module corresponding to the perverse sheaf. Study of such spaces in 1 dimension (i.e., for $\mathbb{C}$ stratified by $\{0\}$ and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$) goes back to the very origins of the theory of $\mathcal{D}$-modules as presented in Kashiwara's 1971 Master Thesis [21, Th. 4.2.7], and to the paper of Komatsu [25] from the same year. These works identify the dimension of the space E_0 in this case with what in the "standard" (much later) description would be denoted by $\dim(\Phi \oplus \Psi)$. Higher-dimensional generalizations were found in the papers of Takeuchi [37] and Schürmann [36] of which the first considers precisely the situation of the complexification of a real arrangement. Spaces which turn out to be identical with our E_C, have also appeared in the work of Bezrukavnikov, Finkelberg and one of the authors, [3], under the name "generalized vanishing cycles". In fact, it was conjec-

tured in [3], p. 50, that a perverse sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ can be uniquely reconstructed from the linear algebra data equivalent to our $(E_C, \gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'})$. From this point of view, we not only prove the conjecture of [3] but find an explicit characterization of the linear algebra data that can appear.

(0.4) Our method is closest to that of Galligo, Granger and Maisonobe [14] (who attribute the original idea to Malgrange). That is, we construct a version of Cousin resolution of a perverse sheaf $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ using a stratification of $\mathbb{C}^n$ into "tube cells" $C + i\mathbb{R}^n$, $C \in \mathcal{C}$, so the terms of the resolution are direct sums of the sheaves of cohomology with supports in such tubes. It turns out that for each C only the sheaf $\mathcal{E}_C = \underline{\mathbb{H}}^{\mathrm{codim}(C)}_{C+i\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F})$ is non-zero, and E_C can be identified with the space of global sections of this sheaf. The main technical point of our study is that the entire Cousin complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ formed by the $\mathcal{E}_C$ can be recovered from linear algebra data represented by the $E_C, \gamma_{C'C}$ and $\delta_{CC'}$, and that $\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{C}$-smoothness and perversity of $\mathcal{E}_\mathbb{C} \simeq \mathcal{F}$ are precisely equivalent to the three conditions above.

(0.5) The concept of collinearity of a triple of faces contains, as a particular case, the familiar condition

$$(*) \qquad l(w'w'') \;=\; l(w') + l(w''), \quad w', w'' \in W.$$

Here W is the Weyl group of a root system $(\mathfrak{h}, \Delta)$. In this case we have the arrangement $\mathcal{H} = \{\alpha^\perp\}_{\alpha\in\Delta}$ of root hyperplanes in $\mathfrak{h}$. Chambers (open faces) of $\mathcal{H}$ form a W-torsor, so for any two chambers A, B there is a unique $w_{AB} \in W$ such that $w_{AB} \cdot A = B$. A triple of chambers (A, B, C) is collinear if and only if $w' = w_{BC}$ and $w'' = w_{AB}$ satisfy (*). The transitivity property $\phi_{AC} = \phi_{BC}\phi_{AB}$ of our double representations is thus remindful of the classical Gindikin - Karpelevich factorization formula, cf. [19, Th.1], and of the cocycle property of the principal series intertwiners [24, 35, 29] (which is another manifestation of that formula).

(0.6) We are grateful to Misha Finkelberg for useful discussions and to Persi Diaconis for showing us some interesting references. M.K. would like to thank Université Paul Sabatier for hospitality and financial support during a visit when a substantial part of this work was carried out.

1 Generalities.

A. Postnikov systems. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a triangulated category. A *left Postnikov system* in $\mathcal{D}$ is a diagram of exact triangles of the form



It gives rise to a sequence of objects and morphisms in $\mathcal{D}$

$$A_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_0} A_1[1] \xrightarrow{\delta_1} A_2[2] \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta_{n-1}} A_n[n], \quad \delta_i = \alpha_{i+1}\beta_i. \tag{1.1}$$

Similarly, a *right Postnikov system* in $\mathcal{D}$ is a diagram of exact triangles of the form



It gives rise to a sequence of objects and morphisms in $\mathcal{D}$

$$A_0 \xrightarrow{\delta'_0} A_1[1] \xrightarrow{\delta'_1} A_2[2] \xrightarrow{\delta'_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta'_{n-1}} A_n[n], \quad \delta'_i = \beta'_{i+1}\alpha'_i. \tag{1.2}$$

Proposition 1.3. *Suppose we have a left resp. right, Postnikov system in $\mathcal{D}$. Then:*

(a) The sequence (1.1) *resp.* (1.2) *is a complex in $\mathcal{D}$, i.e., $\delta_{i+1}\delta_i = 0$, resp. $\delta'_{i+1}\delta'_i = 0$.*

(b) Suppose, in addition, that $\mathcal{D} = D^b(\mathcal{A})$ is the bounded derived category of an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ and assume that each $A_i[i]$ is quasi-isomorphic to an object $B_i \in \mathcal{A}$, so $B_i = H^i(A_i)$ is the only cohomology object of A_i. Then the complex in $\mathcal{A}$

$$B_0 \longrightarrow B_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow B_n$$

induced from (1.1) *resp.* (1.2) *by passing to H^0, is an object of $D^b(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{D}$, isomoprhic to A.*

Proof: (a) follows because the composition of two consecutive morphisms in an exact triangle is equal to 0. Part (b) is proved by induction on the length of the Postnikov system. □

Remark 1.4. In general, the left or right Postnikov system as above exhibits A as a total object of the complex (1.1) or (1.2), see [18], Ch. 4, §2.

B. Filtered topological spaces. By a *space* we mean a topological space homeomorphic to an open subset of a finite CW-complex. We fix a base field $\mathbf{k}$. For a space X we denote by Sh_X the category of sheaves of $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces on X and by $D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$ the corresponding bounded derived category. For any map $f : X \to Y$ of spaces we have the standard functors $f^*, f^! : D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_Y \to D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$ and $f_*, f_! : D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X \to D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_Y$. In particular, we reserve the notation f_* for the derived direct image functor, and denote the usual direct image functor on sheaves by $R^0 f_*$. If $j : Y \hookrightarrow X$ is an embedding of a locally closed subspace, then we denote

$$\underline{R\Gamma}_Y(\mathcal{F}) = j_* j^! \mathcal{F}$$

the complex of "cohomology with support in Y".

If V is a $\mathbf{k}$-vector space, then we denote by $\underline{V}_X$ the constant sheaf on X with stalk V. If $i : Z \hookrightarrow X$ is the embedding a closed subspace, then, by a slight abuse of notation, we consider $\underline{V}_Z$ as a sheaf on X via the direct image functor i_*.

Let X be a space and

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \cdots \subset X_n = X\}$$

be a filtration of X by closed subspaces. We then have the locally closed subspaces $Y_d = X_d \setminus X_{d-1}$ and denote

$$i_d : X_d \hookrightarrow X, \quad j_d : Y_d \hookrightarrow X$$

the embeddings.

Any complex of sheaves $\mathcal{F} \in D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$ includes into two canonical Postnikov systems which we call the *cohomological* (right) and *homological* (left) Postnikov systems of $\mathcal{F}$ relative to the filtration $\mathcal{X}$. The cohomological system has the form



and gives rise to the complex in $D^b\operatorname{Sh}_X$

$$j_{0!}j_0^*\mathcal{F} \longrightarrow j_{1!}j_1^*\mathcal{F}[1] \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow j_{n!}j_n^*\mathcal{F}[n] \tag{1.5}$$

with total object $\mathcal{F}$. The homological system has the form



and gives rise to a complex in $D^b\operatorname{Sh}_X$

$$j_{n*}j_n^!\mathcal{F} \longrightarrow (j_{n-1})_*j_{n-1}^!\mathcal{F}[1] \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow j_{0*}j_0^!\mathcal{F}[n] \tag{1.6}$$

with total object $\mathcal{F}$.

C. Verdier duality. For a space X we denote by

$$\mathbb{D} : D^b\operatorname{Sh}_X \longrightarrow D^b\operatorname{Sh}_X$$

the Verdier duality functor, see [23, 40]. We recall that $\mathbb{D}$ interchanges the functors f_* and $f_!$, as well as the functors f^* and $f^!$ for any continuous map f of spaces.

Let X is a real analytic manifold of dimension d. We denote by or_X the orientation local system on X. This is the rank 1 local system of $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces whose stalk at $x \in X$ is $H_c^d(U, \mathbf{k})$, where U is any open neighborhood of X homeomorphic to a d-ball. In this case

$$\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{F}) = \underline{R\operatorname{Hom}}(\mathcal{F}, \operatorname{or}_X[d]),$$

and we denote

$$\mathcal{F}^{\bigstar} = \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{F})[-d] = \underline{R\,\mathrm{Hom}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathrm{or}_X) \tag{1.7}$$

the shifted Verdier duality which has the advantage of preserving local systems in degree 0.

We further denote by $D^b_{\mathrm{constr}}\,\mathrm{Sh}_X \subset D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$ the subcategory formed by $\mathbb{R}$-constructible complexes, i.e., by complexes whose cohomology sheaves are $\mathbb{R}$-constructible [23]. The functor $\mathbb{D}$ preserves the subcategory $D^b_{\mathrm{constr}}\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$ and its restriction there is a perfect duality. The same is true for $\bigstar$.

If $\mathcal{X}$ is a filtration of X by real analytic subsets, then $\mathbb{D}$ takes the cohomological Postnikov system for $\mathcal{F}$ to the homological Postnikov system for $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{F})$ for any $\mathbb{R}$-constructible complex $\mathcal{F}$.

D. Cellular sheaves and complexes. For background on cellular spaces and sheaves we refer the reader to [10, 30, 41, 42]. Here we present a (self-contained) synopsis of features needed in the rest of the paper.

By a *d-cell* we mean a topological space homeomorphic to an open d-ball. For a d-cell σ we denote

$$\mathrm{or}(\sigma) = H^d_c(\sigma, \mathbf{k})$$

its 1-dimensional orientation space. For constant sheaves on σ the Verdier duality has the form

$$\mathbb{D}(\underline{V}_\sigma) = \underline{V^* \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{or}(\sigma)}_\sigma[d].$$

By a *cellular space* we will mean a space with a filtration $\mathcal{X}$ by closed subspaces such that each $X_d = X_d \setminus X_{d-1}$ is a disjoint union of finitely many d-cells. We denote $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ the set of all cells of X together with the partial order

$$\sigma' \leq \sigma \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sigma' \subset \overline{\sigma}.$$

By a slight abuse of language we will refer to the relation $\leq$ as *cell inclusion*, although, set-theoretically, it is the closures of the cells that are included.

For a cell σ of a cellular space X we denote by $j_\sigma : \sigma \to X$ the corresponding embedding. A cellular space X will called *regular*, if the closure of each d-cell is homeomorphic to a closed d-ball. In the sequel all cellular spaces will be assumed regular.

For any $\mathbf{k}$-vector space V we have an identification in $D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$:

$$\underline{V}_{\overline{\sigma}} = j_{\sigma *}\underline{V}_\sigma = R^0 j_{\sigma *}\underline{V}_\sigma.$$

A *cellular sheaf* on X (with respect to $\mathcal{X}$) is, by definition, a sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on X such that each $j_\sigma^*\mathcal{F}$ is a constant sheaf on σ with finite-dimensional stalks. We denote $\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}$ the category of cellular sheaves on X with respect to $\mathcal{X}$, and by $D^b_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathrm{Sh}_X) \subset D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$ the full subcategory of complexes whose cohomology sheaves lie in $\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}$.

For a cellular sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on X we have the *linear algebra data* which consists of stalks $F_\sigma = H^0(\sigma, j_\sigma^*\mathcal{F})$ and *generalization maps* (terminology taken from [15])

$$\gamma_{\sigma'\sigma} : F_{\sigma'} \longrightarrow F_\sigma, \quad \sigma \leq \sigma'$$

defined as follows. Take a point $x' \in \sigma'$. Then $F_{\sigma'} = H^0(U', \mathcal{F})$, where U' is a sufficiently small contractible neighborhood of x' in X. Let $x \in U' \cap \sigma$. Then $F_\sigma = H^0(U, \mathcal{F})$, where U is a sufficiently small contractible neighborhood of x in X. Taking U small enough, we can assume $U \subset U'$. Then $\gamma_{\sigma'\sigma}$ is given by the restriction map

$$F'_\sigma = H^0(U', \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}} H^0(U, \mathcal{F}) = F_\sigma.$$

The following is by now well known.

Proposition 1.8. *(a) For $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}$ the data $(F_\sigma, \gamma_{\sigma'\sigma})$ form a representation of the poset $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$, i.e., a covariant functor $\mathcal{C} \to \mathrm{Vect}^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathbf{k}}$.*

(b) The construction in (a) defines an equivalence of $\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}$ with $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Vect}^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathbf{k}})$.

(c) The natural functor

$$\phi : D^b\,\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{C}) = D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}} \longrightarrow D^b_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathrm{Sh}_X)$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories.

Proof: (a) and (b) are obvious. Cf. the case of "simplicial complexes" considered in detail by Kashiwara [22]. To see (c), note that the sheaf $j_{\sigma*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}$ corresponds via (b) to the injective object of $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{C})$, i.e., to the covariant functor $R_\sigma : \tau \mapsto (\mathbf{k}\,\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\tau, \sigma))^*$ dual to the representable contravariant one. Therefore for $p \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}}(j_{\sigma*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}, j_{\tau*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}[p]) \;&=\; \mathrm{Ext}^p_{\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}}(j_{\sigma*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}, j_{\tau*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}) \;= \\ = \;\mathrm{Ext}^p_{\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{C})}(R_\sigma.R_\tau) \;&=\; \begin{cases} \mathbf{k}, \text{ if } p = 0,\ \sigma \geq \tau; \\ 0, \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X}(j_{\sigma*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}, j_{\tau*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}[p]) \;=\; \mathrm{Hom}_{D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_\tau}(j_\tau^* j_{\sigma*}\underline{k}, \underline{\mathbf{k}}[p])$$

is given by the RHS of (1.9) as well. This means that the morphism

$$\phi_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}} : \mathrm{Hom}_{D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X}(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G})$$

is an isomorphism whenever both $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are shifts of sheaves of the form $\jmath_{\sigma*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}$. Now, each object of $\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}$ has a finite resolution by direct sums of the injective objects $j_{\sigma*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}$. This means that $\phi_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ is an isomorphism for any $\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G} \in D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_{X,\mathcal{X}}$, i.e., that ϕ is fully faithful. To see that ϕ is essentially surjective, note that the homological Postnikov system of any object $\mathcal{F} \in D^b_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathrm{Sh}_X)$ shows that $\mathcal{F}$ lies in the smallest triangulated category containing all the $j_{\sigma*}\underline{\mathbf{k}}$. □

Remark 1.10. An object of $D^b\,\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{C})$ corresponding to $\mathcal{F} \in D^b_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathrm{Sh}_X)$ by (c) can be seen as "linear algebra data for $\mathcal{F}$ at the level of complexes", i.e., as a choice of actual complexes of vector spaces $F^\bullet_\sigma$ quasi-isomorphic to $R\Gamma(\sigma, j_\sigma^*\mathcal{F})$ and actual morphisms of complexes $\gamma_{\sigma'\sigma} : F^\bullet_{\sigma'} \to F^\bullet_\sigma$ forming a representation of $(\mathcal{C},\leq)$ at the level of complexes.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a cellular sheaf on X represented by linear algebra data $(F^\bullet_\sigma, \gamma_{\sigma'\sigma})$. The cohomological Postnikov system for $\mathcal{F}$ relative to $\mathcal{X}$ gives a complex in $D^b\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$

$$\bigoplus_{\dim(\sigma)=0} j_{\sigma!}(\underline{F_{\sigma_\sigma}}) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\dim(\sigma)=1} j_{\sigma!}(\underline{F_{\sigma_\sigma}})[1] \longrightarrow \cdots$$

whose total object is $\mathcal{F}$. By applying the functor $R\Gamma(X,-)$, we get a Postnikov system in $D^b\,\mathrm{Vect}^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathbf{k}}$ which gives rise to the complex in $D^b\,\mathrm{Vect}^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathbf{k}}$

$$\bigoplus_{\dim(\sigma)=0} F_\sigma \otimes \mathrm{or}(\sigma) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\dim(\sigma)=1} F_\sigma \otimes \mathrm{or}(\sigma) \longrightarrow \cdots \tag{1.11}$$

whose total object is $R\Gamma(X,\mathcal{F})$. By Proposition 1.3(b), this complex represents $R\Gamma(X,\mathcal{F})$. This is the "standard cellular cochain complex" of $\mathcal{F}$.

More generally, let $\mathcal{F} \in D^b_{\mathcal{X}}\,\mathrm{Sh}_X$ be a cellular complex, and $(F^\bullet_\sigma, \gamma_{\sigma'\sigma})$ is a complex of representations of $(\mathcal{C},\leq)$ representing it as in Proposition 1.8(c) and Remark 1.10. Then, replacing in (1.11), each F_σ by $F^\bullet_\sigma$ we get a double complex whose total complex represents $R\Gamma(X,\mathcal{F})$. This follows from compatibility of $R\Gamma$ with forming total complexes of double complexes.

Applying Verdier duality and Proposition 1.3(b) to the cohomological Postnikov system for $\mathcal{F}$ and the (double) complex (1.11), we get:

Proposition 1.12. *Let X be a regular cellular space of dimension n, and $\mathcal{F}$ a cellular complex represented by $(F_\sigma^\bullet, \gamma_{\sigma'\sigma})$. Then the the complex $\mathbb{D}\mathcal{F}[n]$ is quasi-isomorphic to the total complex of the double complex*

$$\bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(\sigma)=0} \underline{F_\sigma^* \otimes \mathrm{or}(\sigma)}_{\overline{\sigma}} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(\sigma)=1} \underline{F_\sigma^* \otimes \mathrm{or}(\sigma)}_{\overline{\sigma}} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

Here each summand is a complex of constant sheaves on the closed cell. □

This is a combinatorial version of the Cousin complex.

2 Background on real arrangements and the three stratifications

A. Faces and sign vectors. Let V be a finite-dimensional real vector space and $\mathcal{H}$ be an arrangement of linear hyperplanes in V. We choose, once and for all, a linear equation $f_H : V \to \mathbb{R}$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ (the essential concepts that we define will not depend on the choice).

By $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ we denote the poset of *flats* of $\mathcal{H}$, i.e., of linear subspaces of the form $\bigcap_{H\in\mathcal{I}} H$ for various subsets $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{H}$. Note that $\mathcal{L}$ contains V (for $\mathcal{I} = \emptyset$). We assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is *central*, i.e., $\{0\} \in \mathcal{L}$.

In the sequel we assume $V = \mathbb{R}^n$ for simplicity. We denote by

$$\operatorname{sgn} : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \{+, -, 0\}$$

the standard sign function. By a *sign vector* we will mean a sequence $(s_H)_{H\in\mathcal{H}} \in \mathcal{H}^{\{+,-,0\}}$ assigning a "sign" to each element of $\mathcal{H}$. Each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ gives rise to a sign vector $(\operatorname{sgn} f_H(x))_{H\in\mathcal{H}}$. Level of this vector function are $\mathbb{R}^n$ into locally closed subsets called *faces*. Thus x and x' lie in the same face, iff $\operatorname{sgn} f_H(x) = \operatorname{sgn} f_H(x')$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$. We will sometime identify a face C with the corresponding sign vector

$$C \leftrightarrow (C_H)_{H\in\mathcal{H}}, \;\; C_H = \operatorname{sgn}(f_H|_C) \in \{+, -, 0\}.$$

Faces are convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$, each given by a system of linear equations and strict linear inequalities [3, 31, 33, 39]. Open faces will be called *chambers*. We denote by $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}}$ the poset of faces, with the partial order given by $C' \le C$, if $C' \subset \overline{C}$. We also write

$$C' <_1 C, \text{ if } C' \le V \text{ and } \dim(C') = \dim(C) - 1$$

and call this relation *codimension 1 inclusion* of cells.

Alternatively, let us introduce a partial order $\le$ on $\{+, -, 0\}$ in which the only nontrivial inequalities are

$$0 \le +, \;\; 0 \le - \tag{2.1}$$

(and $+$ and $-$ are incomparable). This is the order of inclusion of the subsets $\{x \ge 0\}$, $\{x \le 0\}$ and $\{x = 0\}$ in $\mathbb{R}$. Further introduce on $\mathcal{H}^{\{+,-,0\}}$ the Cartesian product partial order. Then

$$C \le D \;\; \Leftrightarrow \;\; C_H \le D_H \text{ for each } H \in \mathcal{H},$$

i.e., $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\{+,-,0\}}$ is an embedding of posets. Faces form a regular cellular stratification of $\mathbb{R}^n$, which we also denote $\mathcal{C}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}$ does not depend on the choice of equations f_H, both as a poset and as a stratification. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $\sigma(x) = \sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ the face containing x. Similarly, if $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subset contained in one face, we denote by $\sigma(x) = \sigma_{\mathcal{H}}(X)$ this face.

B. Functoriality of faces. Any $L \in \mathcal{L}$ gives rise to two induced hyperplane arrangements:

- The arrangement $\mathcal{H} \cap L$ in L, formed by the $H \cap L$, $H \in \mathcal{H}$, $H \not\supset L$.
- The arrangement $\mathcal{H}/L$ in V/L, formed by the H/L, $H \in \mathcal{H}$, $H \supset L$.

We have therefore the face stratifications $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}\cap L}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}/L}$ of these arrangements.

For any face $C \in \mathcal{C}$ be denote $\mathbb{L}(C)$ the $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace in $\mathbb{R}^n$ spanned by C and denote by

$$\pi_C : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$$

the projection. Note that π_C induces an isomorphism of posets

$$\overline{\pi}_C : \mathcal{C}^{\geq C} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)}, \quad D \mapsto D/\mathbb{L}(C). \tag{2.2}$$

Here $\mathcal{C}^{\geq C}$ is the *star* of $\mathcal{C}$, i.e., the poset of $D \in \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $D \geq C$. For such a D, we denote $D/\mathbb{L}(C) = \pi_C(D)$ (which is a chamber of $\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)$).

C. Composition of faces. Let $(\Sigma, \leq)$ be a poset. As usual, we write $a < b$, if $a \leq b$ and $a \neq b$. Following [5], introduce a binary operation $\star$ on Σ, called *composition*, by

$$a \star b = \begin{cases} b, & \text{if } a < b, \\ a, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This operation is associative but not commutative in general. If $\leq$ is a total order, then $a \circ b = \max(a, b)$ is commutative. Thus $\star$ can be seen as a generalization of the maximum to partially ordered sets.

We are interested in the case when $\Sigma = \{+, -, 0\}$ with the partial order (2.1).

Define an associative operation $\circ$ on the set $\mathcal{H}^{\{+,-,0\}}$ of sign vectors by putting

$$(s \circ t)_H = s_H \star t_H, \ \ H \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Proposition 2.3. *Let $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$ be two faces with corresponding sign vectors $(C_H)_{H\in\mathcal{H}}$ and $(D_H)_{H\in\mathcal{H}}$. Then:*

(a) The sign vector $(C_H \circ D_H)_{H\in\mathcal{H}}$ corresponds to a (necessarily unique) face $C \circ D$. We thus obtain an associative binary operation $\circ$ on $\mathcal{C}$.

(b) Explicitly, choose any $c \in C, d \in D$. Then

$$C \circ D \;=\; \sigma\big((1-\epsilon)c + \epsilon d\big),\;\; 0 < \epsilon \ll 1$$

is the cell containing a small displacement of c in the direction of d.

(c) Alternatively, $C \circ D$ is the minimal cell $K \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $K \geq C$ and $K + \mathbb{L}(C) \supset D$.

Remark 2.4. The operation $\circ$ on $\mathcal{C}$ is the cornerstone of the "covector" axiomatization of oriented matroids, see [4], Axioms 4.1.1. An arrangement of hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the same as a *representable oriented matroid*, see *loc. cit.* §2.1. The characterization in (b) is also taken from *loc. cit.* §4.1.

This operation was introduced (in a slightly different context) by Tits, [38], under the name of "projection". It plays a basic role in the studies of random walks on hyperplane arrangements, cf. [9] and references therein.

Proof of Proposition 2.3: Parts (a) and (b) follow from the next lemma, whose verification is left to the reader.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, we have*

$$\mathrm{sgn}\big((1-\epsilon)x + \epsilon y\big) \;=\; \mathrm{sgn}(x) \circ \mathrm{sgn}(y). \quad \square$$

Part (c) follows from (b). Indeed, (b) implies that $(C \circ D) + \mathbb{L}(C) \supset D$. Conversely, suppose $K \geq C$ and $K + \mathbb{L}(C) \supset D$. We claim that $K \geq C \circ D$, that is, $K_H \geq C_H + D_H$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$. We already know that $K_H \geq C_H$, since $K \geq C$. We need to prove that whenever $D_H > C_H$, we also have $K_H \geq D_H$. But $D_H > C_H$ means that $C_H = 0$ and $D_H \neq 0$, that is, $C \subset H$ but $D \not\subset H$. The statement that $K_H \geq D_H$ means therefore $K_H = D_H$, that is, K and D lie on the same side of H. But this is clear since $D \subset K + \mathbb{L}(C)$ and $\mathbb{L}(C) \subset H$ since $C \subset H$. $\square$

For future reference let us note yet another characterization of $C \circ D$. Consider the image $\pi_C(D) \subset \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$. This image lies in one face but may itself not be a face of the quotient arrangement $\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)$. We denote $\sigma_{\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)}(\pi_C(D)) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)}$ the cell of $\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)$ containing $\pi_C(D)$.

Proposition 2.6.

$$C \circ D \;=\; \overline{\pi}_C^{-1}\sigma_{\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)}(\pi_C(D)),$$

where $\overline{\pi}_C$ *is the isomorphism of posets from* (2.2).

Proof: This is a reformulation of Proposition 2.3(c). □

We further note the following monotonicity properties of the composition.

Proposition 2.7. *(a) If* $D' \leq D$*, then for any* C *we have* $C \circ D' \leq C \circ D$*.*

(b) For any C *and* D *the flat* $\mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$ *is the minimal flat* $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ *containing both* $\mathbb{L}(C)$ *and* $\mathbb{L}(D)$*. In particular, if* $C' \leq C$*, then for any* D *we have* $\mathbb{L}(C' \circ D) \subset \mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$*.*

Proof: (a) follows from the obvious fact that the operation $a \star b$ on a poset Σ is monotone in the second argument. Part (b) follows because

$$\mathbb{L}(C \circ D) \;=\; \bigcap_{C_H \circ D_H = 0} H,$$

and $C_H \circ D_H = 0$ means that $C_H = D_H = 0$, i.e., $C, D \subset H$. □

D. Complexified arrangement and its stratifications. Let $V_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C}^n$ be the complexification of $V = \mathbb{R}^n$. For $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ we denote by $\Re(z), \Im(z) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ its real and imaginary parts. For $L \in \mathcal{L}$ we denote by $L_{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ its complexification. Accordingly, we write $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{C}}(X)$ for the $\mathbb{C}$-linear span of $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. We have therefore the *complexified arrangement* $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of complex hyperplanes in $V_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C}^n$, formed by the $H_{\mathbb{C}}, H \in \mathcal{H}$. We will be interested in three natural stratifications of $\mathbb{C}^n$ induced by $\mathcal{H}$.

The **complex stratification** $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$ consists of the open parts of the complexified flats

$$L^{\circ}_{\mathbb{C}} = L_{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \bigcup_{H \not\supset L} H_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

The $\mathbf{s}^{(2)}$**-stratification** $\mathcal{S}^{(2)} = \mathcal{C} + i\mathcal{C}$ consists of direct product cells $C + iD$, $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$.

The $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$**-stratification** $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ consists of cells $[C, D]$ defined for any *chamber interval*, by which we mean a pair $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C \leq D$. By definition, $[C, D]$ consists of $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that:

(a) $\Im(z) \in C$.

(b) $\Re(z)$ lies in $\pi_C^{-1}(D/\mathbb{L}(C))$.

Note that $\dim[C, D] = \dim(C) + \dim(D)$.

The stratifications $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$, $\nu = 1, 2$, were introduced and studied by Björner and Ziegler [5]. They use a slightly different definition, based on the following two complex generalizations of the sign function: the obvious one

$$\mathbf{s}^{(2)} : \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \{+, -, 0\}^2, \quad \mathbf{s}^{(2)}(a + bi) = (\mathrm{sgn}(a), \mathrm{sgn}(b)),$$

and the less obvious one

$$\mathbf{s}^{(1)} : \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \{i, j, +, -, 0\}, \quad \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(a + bi) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } b > 0, \\ j & \text{if } b < 0, \\ + & \text{if } b = 0 \text{ and } a > 0, \\ - & \text{if } b = 0 \text{ and } a < 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } b = a = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2.8. *Two vectors $z, w \in \mathbb{C}^n$ lie in the same stratum of $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$, $\nu = 1, 2$, if and only if we have $\mathbf{s}^{(\nu)}(f_H(z)) = \mathbf{s}^{(\nu)}(f_H(w))$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof: Obvious for $\nu = 2$. For $\nu = 1$ this is the content of Theorem 5.1(ii) of [5]. □

We will view each $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$, $\nu = 0, 1, 2$, as a poset, i.e., as the set of strata with the partial order $\leq$ defined by $S' \leq S$ iff $S' \subset \overline{S}$.

Proposition 2.9. *(a) Denoting by $\prec$ the relation of refinement of stratifications, we have*

$$\mathcal{S}^{(2)} \prec \mathcal{S}^{(1)} \prec \mathcal{S}^{(0)}.$$

In particular, we have order preserving maps of posets $\mathcal{S}^{(2)} \to \mathcal{S}^{(1)} \to \mathcal{S}^{(0)}$ describing which stratum of $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu-1)}$ contains a given stratum of $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$, $\nu = 1, 2$. These maps are as follows:

(b) The stratum of $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$ containing a cell $[C, D] \in \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$, $C \leq D$, is $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{C}}(D)^\circ$.

(c) The stratum of $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ containing a cell $D + iC \in \mathcal{S}^{(2)}$, is $[C, C \circ D]$.

(d) For two cells $[C', D']$ and $[C, D]$ of $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ we have $[C', D'] \leq [C, D]$, if and only if $C' \leq C$ and $C \circ D' \leq D$.

Proof: (a) Note that the stratification $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$ can also be described in the style of Proposition 2.8, by using the sign-type function

$$\mathbf{s}^{(0)} : \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \{0, *\}, \quad \mathbf{s}^{(0)}(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } z = 0, \\ *, & \text{if } z \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

The statement follows since the three stratifications of $\mathbb{C}$ induced by the three sign functions $\mathbf{s}^{(\nu)}$, $\nu = 0, 1, 2$, refine each other as claimed.

(b) The $\mathbb{R}$-linear span of $\pi_C^{-1}(D/\mathbb{L}(C))$, the allowable range for $\Re(z)$, $z \in [C, D]$, is $\mathbb{L}(D)$. So $[C, D]$ cannot be contained in any $\mathbb{C}$-linear subspace strictly smaller than $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{C}}(D)$. Also, by construction it is indeed contained in $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{C}}(D)$, since the allowable range for $\Im(z)$ is $C \subset \overline{D}$.

(c) This follows by definition of $C \circ D$.

(d) This is Proposition 5.2 of [5]. □

3 Constructible complexes on arrangements

We keep the notation of the previous section, in particular, concerning the three stratifications $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$ of $\mathbb{C}^n$, $\nu = 0, 1, 2$, induced by the arrangement $\mathcal{H}$.

A. Constructible sheaves. A sheaf $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ will be called $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-*smooth*, if its cohomology sheaves are locally constant on each stratum of $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$. We will say that $\mathcal{F}$ is $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-*constructible*, if it is $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-smooth with finite-dimensional stalks. A complex $\mathcal{F} \in D^b \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ will be called $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-smooth (resp. $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-constructible), if if all the cohomology sheaves of $\mathcal{F}$ are $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-smooth (resp. $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-constructible). We denote by $D^b_{\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n} \subset D^b \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ the full subcategory of $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-constructible complexes.

In particular, for $\nu = 2, 1$, since $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$ is cellular, an $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-smooth sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ is uniquely defined by its cellular stalks and generalization maps which we denote, respectively, as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{F}\big|_{D+iC}, \quad \gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{D'+iC',D+iC} : \mathcal{F}\big|_{D'+iC'} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}\big|_{D+iC}, \ \ D' \le D, \ C' \le C; \\ \mathcal{F}_{[C,D]} = \mathcal{F}\big|_{[C,D]}, \quad \gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{[C',D'],[C,D]} : \mathcal{F}_{[C',D']} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{[C,D]}, \ \ [C',D'] \le [C,D]. \end{array} \tag{3.1}$$

We use similar notations for the case when $\mathcal{F}$ is an $\mathcal{S}^{(\nu)}$-smooth complex. In this case the stalks are complexes of vector spaces and we can assume, by using Proposition 1.8(c), that the generalization maps are morphisms of complexes forming a representation of the poset of cells.

B. From $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$-smoothness to $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smoothness. We will need to compare the conditions of smoothness with respect to different stratifications.

Definition 3.2. An inclusion of $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$-cells $[C', D'] \le [C, D]$ will be called *elementary*, if one of the two following cases hold:

(1) $C' \le C$ and $D' = D$, so we have a flag $C' \le C \le D$.

(2) $C = D$, $\mathbb{L}(D) = \mathbb{L}(D')$, $\dim(C') = \dim(D') - 1$, and $C' \le D$. In other words, C' is a codimension 1 "wall" separating D and D'.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$-smooth sheaf. The following are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{F}$ is $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smooth.

(ii) The map $\gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{[C',D'],[C,D]}$ is an isomorphism for each elementary inclusion $[C',D'] \leq [C,D]$.

Proof: The tautological equivalent of (i) is

(iii) The map $\gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{[C',D'],[C,D]}$ is an isomorphism for each inclusion $[C',D'] \leq [C,D]$ such that $\mathbb{L}(D') = \mathbb{L}(D)$.

Indeed, by Proposition 2.9(b), inclusions in (iii) are precisely all inclusions of $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$-cells in the same $\mathbf{s}^{(0)}$-stratum. Clearly (iii) is stronger than (ii). So we need to prove that (ii) implies (iii).

Note that $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ is a ranked poset with the rank function given by the dimension of the cells, see [5], Th. 5.1(iii). Therefore any inclusion $[C',D'] \leq [C,D]$ in (iii) can be expressed as the composition of codimension 1 inclusions, each satisfying the conditions in (iii). So we can restrict the proof of (iii) to the case of codimension 1 inclusions, i.e., to assume that $\dim(C') = \dim(C) - 1$.

To prove (iii) under this assumption, it is enough to fix $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and to concentrate on codimension 1 inclusions with $\mathbb{L}(D) = \mathbb{L}(D') = L$. For this, we do not need to consider any faces outside L, so we can assume that $L = \mathbb{R}^n$ and D and D' are n-dimensional. We then proceed by downward induction on $m = \dim(C)$, starting with $m = n$.

In the case $m = n$ (base of downward induction), our inclusion has the form $[C',D'] \leq [D,D]$, as $C = D$. By Proposition 2.9(d), the inclusion means that $C' \leq D$. As $\dim(C') = \dim(D') - 1 = \dim(D) - 1$, we have that either $D' = D$, so the inclusion is elementary of type (1), or D' and D are separated by the wall C', so the inclusion is elementary of type (2).

We now assume by induction that for each codimension 1 inclusion

$$[C',D'] \leq [C,D],\ \ \mathbb{L}(D') = \mathbb{L}(D) = L$$

with $\dim(C) > m$, the generalization map $\gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{[C',D'],[C,D]}$ is already known to be an isomorphism, and consider the case $\dim(C) = m$. We use the following obvious

Lemma 3.4. *If, in a commutative square of morphisms in any category, 3 out of 4 arrows are isomorphisms. then the fourth arrow is an isomorphism as well.* □



Figure 1: Reduction of an inclusion $[C', D'] \leq [C, D]$.

Our inclusion has the form

$$[C', D'] \leq [C, D], \;\; C' \leq C, \;\; C \circ D' = D,$$

with D', D being chambers (open faces). Let $\delta(D, D')$ be the *chamber distance* between D and D', i.e., the minimal length of a sequence

$$D = D_0, D_1, \cdots, D_l = D'$$

such that each D_i is a chamber, and each D_p, D_{p+1} have a codimension 1 face in common. Thus $\delta(D, D') = 0$ means that $D' = D$, in which case our inclusion is elementary of type (1). We will use the above lemma together with induction on $\delta(D, D')$.

Take generic points $c \in C, d' \in D'$ and form the straight line interval $[c, d']$ oriented towards d'. By Proposition 2.3 (b), this interval, after leaving C, first hits $D = C \circ D'$. Since D' is a chamber, our interval will, after leaving D, hit some cell $C_1 \geq C'$ of positive codimension, and then a chamber $D_1 \geq C_1$, see Fig. 1. Note that $\delta(D_1, D') < \delta(D, D')$.

We then have a commutative square in (the category corresponding to) the poset $(\mathcal{S}^{(1)}, \leq)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [C', D'] & \xrightarrow{p} & [C_1, D_1] \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle q} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle r} \\ [C, D] & \xrightarrow[s]{} & [D, D]. \end{array}$$

In this square, q is our inclusion in question, p is an inclusion with the same or larger m but smaller δ, and r, s are inclusions with larger d. Now, the

generalization maps for $\mathcal{F}$ can be seen as a functor $\gamma^{\mathcal{F}} : (\mathcal{S}^{(1)}, \leq) \to \mathrm{Vect}_{\mathbf{k}}$, so the above square gives a commutative square of vector spaces. By induction, p, r, s are taken by $\gamma^{\mathcal{F}}$ into isomorphisms, so by Lemma 3.4, $\gamma^{\mathcal{F}}(q)$ is an isomorphism as well. $\square$.

C. Complexes of cohomology with support and their linear algebra data.

Let $\mathcal{F} \in D^b_{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$. Define

$$\mathcal{R}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{F}} = \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F})[n] \quad \in \quad D^b_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{R}^n}). \tag{3.5}$$

This is a cellular complex on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (with respect to $\mathcal{C}$, the stratification by chambers of $\mathcal{H}$). Therefore it can be defined by the linear algebra data consisting of complexes and generalization maps

$$E^{\bullet}_C = E^{\bullet}_C(\mathcal{F}) = R\Gamma(C, \mathcal{R}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{F}}), \quad \gamma_{C'C} : E^{\bullet}_{C'} \to E^{\bullet}_C, \quad C' \leq C \in \mathcal{C} \tag{3.6}$$

forming a representation of $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$ in complexes of vector spaces.

More generally, let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ be a chamber of codimension d. Consider the "tube chamber"

$$j_C : \mathbb{R}^n + iC \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n \tag{3.7}$$

and form the complex

$$\mathcal{E}^{\bullet}_C \;=\; \mathcal{E}^{\bullet}_C(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n + iC}(\mathcal{F})[d] \;=\; j_{C*} j_C^{!}(\mathcal{F})[d]. \tag{3.8}$$

Thus $\mathcal{E}^{\bullet}_C$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-constructible complex on $\mathbb{C}^n$, supported on the closure $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$. We denote by $p_C, \overline{p}_C$ the composite projections

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^n + iC &\xrightarrow{\Re} \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C) \\ \mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C} &\xrightarrow{\Re} \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C) \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Proposition 3.10. *The complex $\mathcal{E}^{\bullet}_C$, considered as a complex of sheaves on $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$, has the form $\overline{p}_C^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}$, where $\mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}$ is a complex on $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$ cellular with respect to the stratification by chambers of the quotient arrangement $\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)$.*

Proof: It is enough to show that $j_C^{!}\mathcal{F}$ has the form $p_C^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}$ for some $\mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}$ as above, since the derived direct image extension from $\mathbb{R}^n + iC$ to $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$ will then proceed along the directions in which $p_C^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}$ is constant.

Consider the fibers of the projection p_C. We need to prove that he cohomology sheaves of $j_C^!\mathcal{F}$ are constant along these fibers. But these fibers are contractible complex manifolds

$$Z_a \;=\; a + \mathbb{L}(C) + iC, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C).$$

So it is enough to show that each $\underline{H}^j(j_C^!\mathcal{F})$ is locally constant along each Z_a, which is a statement about the characteristic variety of the $\mathbb{R}$-constructible complex $j_C^!\mathcal{F}$. Because $\mathcal{F}$ is $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$-smooth, the statement reduces to the next lemma.

Lemma 3.11. *Let H be any hyperplane from $\mathcal{H}$. Then each Z_a either is contained in $H_{\mathbb{C}}$ or does not meet $H_{\mathbb{C}}$.*

Proof of lemma: For

$$z = a + b + ic \;\in\; Z_a, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^n,\; c \in C,\; b \in \mathbb{L}(C),$$

we have

$$f_H(z) = f_H(a) + f_H(b) + i f_H(c).$$

If this is zero, then by taking the imaginary part, we get $f_H(c) = 0$. Now, since C is a cell, there are only two possibilities:

(1) $f_H(c) = 0$ for all $c \in C$;

(2) $f_H(c) \neq 0$ for all $c \in C$.

Assume that $Z_a \cap H_{\mathbb{C}} \neq \emptyset$. Then the possibility (1) must hold. This implies that $(f_H)|_{\mathbb{L}(C)} = 0$, so $f_H(b) = 0$. Therefore $f_H(z) = f_H(a)$ for any $z \in Z_a$ so f_H is constant on Z_a. Therefore $Z_a \cap H_{\mathbb{C}} \neq \emptyset$ implies that $Z_a \subset H_{\mathbb{C}}$. □

Proposition 3.10 is proved.

Since $\mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}$ is a cellular complex, it is determined by linear algebra data which we denote

$$E_D^{C\bullet},\;\; D \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)}, \quad \gamma_{D'D}^C : E_{D'}^{C\bullet} \longrightarrow E_D^{C\bullet},\;\; D' \leq D. \tag{3.12}$$

Proposition 3.13. *We have canonical identifications (quasi-isomorphisms of complexes of $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces compatible with the maps γ)*

$$E_D^{C\bullet} \simeq E^{\bullet}_{\overline{\pi}_C^{-1}(D)} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{or}(C), \quad \gamma_{D'D}^C = \gamma_{\overline{\pi}_C^{-1}(D'),\overline{\pi}_C^{-1}(D)} \otimes \mathrm{Id}\,.$$

Here $\overline{\pi}_C$ is the isomorphism of posets from (2.2).

Proof: Let $K = \overline{\pi}_C^{-1}(D)$, so $K \geq C$. We start with recalling the definitions of $E_D^{C\bullet}$ and $E_K^\bullet$ side by side. The natural projection $\pi : K \to D$ has contractible fibers. The cohomology sheaves of the complex $\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n+iC}(\mathcal{F})[d]$ are constant on $K + iC$, while the cohomology sheaves of $\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F})[n]$ are constant on K. Denote

$$\mathcal{G} = \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n+i\mathbb{L}(C)}(\mathcal{F})[d].$$

Because C is open in $\mathbb{L}(C)$, we have

$$E_D^{C\bullet} = \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}|_D = \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n+iC}(\mathcal{F})[d]\big|_{K+iC} = \mathcal{G}\big|_{K+iC}$$

(restriction of a cellular complex to a cell, considered as a complex of vector spaces). On the other hand, we have

$$E_K^\bullet \;=\; \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{F}|_K \;=\; \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F})[n]\big|_K = \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{G}[n-d]\big|_K.$$

To compare these, we note that $K = K + i0$ lies in $K + i\overline{C}$ but not in $K + iC$ proper.

However, we claim that the cohomology sheaves of $\mathcal{G}$ are constant on the whole of $K + i\mathbb{L}(C)$. This is a consequence of the following analog of Lemma 3.11.

Lemma 3.14. *Let H be a hyperplane from $\mathcal{H}$. Then $H_\mathbb{C}$ meets $K + i\mathbb{L}(C)$ if and only if $H_\mathbb{C}$ contains $K + i\mathbb{L}(C)$.*

Proof of the lemma: If $f_H(k + iy) = 0$ for some $k \in K$, $y \in \mathbb{L}(c)$, then by taking the real part, we find $f(k) = 0$ and, since K is a cell, conclude that $(f_H)|_K = 0$. Now, since $C \leq K$, $(f_H)|_C = 0$ as well and therefore $(f_H)|_{\mathbb{L}(C)} = 0$. Therefore $f_H(k + iy) = f_H(k) + if_H(y) = 0$ for each $k \in K$ and $y \in \mathbb{L}(C)$. □

The constancy of $\underline{H}^j(\mathcal{G})$ on $K + i\mathbb{L}(C)$ implies, by the local Poincaré duality, that

$$\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{G}|_K = \mathcal{G}|_{K+iC}[d] \otimes \mathrm{or}(C),$$

whence the identification of stalks as claimed. Identification of the maps $\gamma_{D'D}^C$ is done similarly. Proposition 3.13 is proved.

Remark 3.15. Let us indicate another, perhaps more geometric view on Proposition 3.13. Let $x \in C$ and T be a small transversal slice to $\mathbb{L}(C)$ at x, i.e., a subset of the form $S + x$ where S is a small open ball in a linear

subspace $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $M \oplus \mathbb{L}(C) = \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus T fits into a diagram of embeddings

$$T \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{j_0} \mathbb{C}^n.$$

The composition of ϵ with the projection $q : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$ is an embedding of a small ball into $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$. Proposition 3.13 can be reformulated by saying that

$$(q\epsilon)^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}} \;=\; \epsilon^* \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{or}(C).$$

Both sides of this proposed isomorphism can be identified as certain complexes of cohomology with support. First, by transversality and Poincaré duality,

$$\epsilon^* \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}} \;=\; \epsilon^! \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{or}(C)[n-d],$$

and so, since $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}} = j_0^! \mathcal{F}[n]$,

$$\epsilon^* \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}} \;=\; (j_0\epsilon)^! \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{or}(C)[2n-d].$$

Second, take another point $y \in C$ and let $T' = T + iy \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be the translation of T by iy, fitting into the diagram of embeddings

$$T' \xrightarrow{\epsilon'} \mathbb{R}^n + iC \xrightarrow{j_C} \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Then T' is transversal to the fibers of p_C and therefore $(q\epsilon)^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}$ is identified with $(\epsilon')^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet}$, after identification of T with T' via the shift. Again, by transversality of T' to the fibers of p_C (and the fact that they are canonically oriented, being complex manifolds), we find that

$$(\epsilon')^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet} = (\epsilon')^! \mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet}[2n-2d] = (j_C\epsilon')^! \mathcal{F}[2n-d].$$

Using the canonical identification $\mathrm{or}(C)^{\otimes 2} = \mathbf{k}$, the proposition thus reduces to the claim that the complexes of cohomology with support in T and T' for $\mathcal{F}$ are identified. Further, Lemma 3.14 can be seen as identifying the stratifications induced by $\mathcal{H}$ on T and T' and so allows one to prove the desired claim by a homotopy argument, deforming y to 0.

Corollary 3.16. *(a) The complex $\mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet}$ of sheaves on $\mathbb{C}^n$ is smooth with respect to the stratification $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ (and therefore to $\mathcal{S}^{(2)}$).*

(b) The stalks and generalization maps of $\mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet}$ on cells of $\mathcal{S}^{(2)}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet}\big|_{iC_1+D} = \begin{cases} E^{\bullet}_{C\circ D} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C), & \text{if } C_1 \le C; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\gamma^{\mathcal{E}_C^{\bullet}}_{iC_1'+D',iC_1+D} = \gamma_{C\circ D',C\circ D} \otimes \mathrm{Id}, \quad C_1' \le C_1 \le C,\ D' \le D.$$

(c) The stalks and generalization maps of $\mathcal{E}^\bullet_C$ on cells of $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet_C|_{[C_1,D]} = \begin{cases} E^\bullet_{C\circ D}\otimes \mathrm{or}(C) & \text{if } C_1 \le C, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\gamma^{\mathcal{E}^\bullet_C}_{[C_1',D_1'],[C_1,D]} = \gamma_{C\circ D',C\circ D}\otimes \mathrm{Id}\,.$$

□

In particular, putting $D=\{0\}$ in part (b) of the corollary, we get quasi-isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} R\Gamma(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathcal{E}^\bullet_C) \;\simeq\; R\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C),\mathcal{E}^{\bullet,\mathrm{red}}_C) \;\simeq \\ \simeq\; E_0^{C\bullet}\otimes \mathrm{or}(C) \;=\; E^\bullet_C\otimes \mathrm{or}(C). \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

At the very right we have the complexes appearing in the description of the cellular complex $\mathcal{R}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}}$.

4 Perverse sheaves and double quivers

A. The Cousin complex. We keep the notations of the previous section. Put $X = \mathbb{C}^n$ and consider the filtration of X by closed subspaces

$$X_d \;=\; \bigcup_{\dim(C)\le d} \mathbb{R}^n + iC, \tag{4.1}$$

so that

$$Y_d \;=\; X_d \setminus X_{d-1} \;=\; \bigsqcup_{\dim(C)=p} \mathbb{R}^n + iC.$$

Let $\mathcal{F} \in D^b_{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}} \operatorname{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ be an $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-constructible complex. We consider the corresponding homological Postnikov system for $\mathcal{F}$. The associated complex in the derived category with total object $\mathcal{F}$ has the form

$$\mathcal{E}^{\bullet\bullet} = \mathcal{E}^{\bullet\bullet}(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \Big\{ \bigoplus_{\operatorname{codim}(C)=0} \mathcal{E}^\bullet_C \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \bigoplus_{\operatorname{codim}(C)=1} \mathcal{E}^\bullet_C \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \mathcal{E}^\bullet_0 \Big\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Here $\mathcal{E}^\bullet_C$ has been defined in (3.8). In particular, by applying the functor $R\Gamma(\mathbb{C}^n, -)$, we get a Postnikov system in $D^b \operatorname{Vect}^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathbf{k}}$ whose associated complex with total object $R\Gamma(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{F})$ has the form

$$\bigoplus_{\operatorname{codim}(C)=0} E^\bullet_C \otimes \operatorname{or}(C) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \bigoplus_{\operatorname{codim}(C)=1} E^\bullet_C \otimes \operatorname{or}(C) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} E^\bullet_0 \otimes \operatorname{or}(0). \tag{4.3}$$

We will call (4.3) the *Cousin complex* of $\mathcal{F}$. In particular, the differential $\widetilde{\delta}$ of this complex splits into matrix elements

$$\widetilde{\delta}_{CC'} : E^\bullet_C \otimes \operatorname{or}(C) \longrightarrow E^\bullet_{C'} \otimes \operatorname{or}(C'), \quad C' <_1 C.$$

Note that for a codimension 1 face C' of a convex polyhedron C we have a canonical coorientation, i.e., a canonical trivialization of $\operatorname{or}(C)^* \otimes \operatorname{or}(C')$, which allows us to write the matrix elements as maps

$$\delta_{CC'} = \delta^{\mathcal{F}}_{CC'} : E_C \longrightarrow E_{C'}, \quad C' <_1 C. \tag{4.4}$$

Proposition 4.5. *The maps of complexes $\delta_{CC'}$ commute, i.e., extend to a contravariant representation of the poset $(\mathcal{C}, \le)$ in complexes of $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces.*

Proof: Indeed, the condition $\widetilde{\delta}^2 = 0$ implies that the $\widetilde{\delta}_{CC'}$ anticommute, so the $\delta_{CC'}$ commute by the antisymmetry of the orientation isomorphisms. □

Proposition 4.6. *We have canonical identifications*

$$E_C^\bullet(\mathcal{F}^\bigstar) \;\simeq\; E_C(\mathcal{F})^*, \quad \delta_{CC'}^{\mathcal{F}^\bigstar} = (\gamma_{C'C}^{\mathcal{F}})^*$$

(dual complexes and adjoint maps).

Proof: Let $j : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be the embedding. Since Verdier duality interchanges $j^!$ and j^*, we have a canonical quasi-isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}^\bigstar})^\bigstar \;=\; \big(\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F}^\bigstar)[n]\big)^\bigstar \;\simeq\; \mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}.$$

Now, $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ can be understood by restricting to $\mathbb{R}^n$ the homological Postnikov system corresponding to the filtration (4.1). This gives a complex in derived category with total object $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ obtained by restricting $\mathcal{E}^{\bullet\bullet}(\mathcal{F})$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ which, explicitly, gives the following:

$$\bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(C)=0} \underline{E_C^\bullet \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)}_{\overline{C}} \xrightarrow{(\widetilde{\delta}_{CC'})} \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(C)=1} \underline{E_C^\bullet \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)}_{\overline{C}} \xrightarrow{(\widetilde{\delta}_{CC'})} \cdots \tag{4.7}$$

Indeed, for any C

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \;=\; \underline{E_C^\bullet \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)}_{\overline{C}}.$$

On the other hand, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}^\bigstar}$ is given by complexes of vector spaces $E_C^\bullet(\mathcal{F}^\bigstar)$ and generalization maps $\gamma_{C'C}^{\mathcal{F}^\bigstar}$. So by Proposition 1.12 the shifted Verdier dual $(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}^\bigstar})^\bigstar$ is the complex

(4.8)

$$\bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(C)=0} \underline{E_C(\mathcal{F}^\bigstar)^* \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)}_{\overline{C}} \xrightarrow{(\gamma_{C'C''}^{\mathcal{F}^\bigstar})^*} \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(C)=1} \underline{E_C(\mathcal{F}^\bigstar)^* \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)}_{\overline{C}} \xrightarrow{(\gamma_{C'C''}^{\mathcal{F}^\bigstar})^*} \cdots$$

Comparing (4.7) and (4.8), we get our statement. □

B. Perverse sheaves. Let $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}) \subset D^b_{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}}\,\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ be the full subcategory of perverse sheaves. We choose the following normalization of the perversity conditions for a complex $\mathcal{F}$ (differing by a shift from that of [23] §10.3):

(P^-) For each p the sheaf $\underline{H}^p(\mathcal{F})$ is supported on a closed complex subspace of codimension $\geq p$.

(P^+) If $l : Z \to X$ is a locally closed embedding of a smooth analytic sub manifold of codimension p, then the sheaf $\underline{H}^q(l^! \mathcal{F}) = \underline{\mathbb{H}}^q_Z(\mathcal{F})|_Z$ is zero for $q < p$.

With respect to this definition, a constant sheaf on $\mathbb{C}^n$ is perverse, if put in degree 0. The normalized Verdier duality functor $\bigstar$ interchanges (P^-) and (P^+) and preserves $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$.

Proposition 4.9. *(a) If $\mathcal{F}$ is perverse, then each $E^\bullet_C(\mathcal{F})$ is quasi-isomorphic to one vector space $E_C(\mathcal{F})$ in degree 0.*

(b) For any $C \in \mathcal{C}$ the functor

$$E_C : \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Vect}^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \mathcal{F} \mapsto E_C(\mathcal{F})$$

is an exact functor of abelian categories.

Proof: The functor

$$E^\bullet_C : D^b_{\mathcal{H}_C} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n} \longrightarrow D^b \mathrm{Vect}^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \mathcal{F} \mapsto E^\bullet_C(\mathcal{F})$$

is an exact functor of triangulated categories. So (b) will follow from (a), and we concentrate on (a).

Because of Proposition 4.6, it is enough to show that $H^i E^\bullet_C(\mathcal{F})$ vanishes for $i > 0$, since vanishing for $i < 0$ will then follow by duality. Since the $E^\bullet_C(\mathcal{F})$ are the linear algebra data describing the cellular complex $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{F} = \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F})[n]$, we need to show that

$$\underline{\mathbb{H}}^p_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F}) = 0, \quad p > n.$$

From the spectral sequence

$$\underline{H}^i_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\underline{H}^j(\mathcal{F})) \;\Rightarrow\; \underline{\mathbb{H}}^{i+j}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F})$$

we see that it is enough to show that

$$\underline{H}^i_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\underline{H}^j(\mathcal{F})) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i > n - j.$$

But by (P^+), the sheaf $\underline{H}^j(\mathcal{F})$ is supported on the union of complex flats $L_\mathbb{C}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ of codimension $\geq j$, i.e., of dimension $\leq n - j$. Since each such $L_\mathbb{C}$ is the complexification of the real flat $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we see that $L_\mathbb{C} \cap \mathbb{R}^n = L$ has real codimension $d = \dim_\mathbb{R}(L)$ in $L_\mathbb{C}$. In other words, the embedding $L \subset L_\mathbb{C}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^d \subset \mathbb{C}^d$. Now, it is a general property that for any sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ on $\mathbb{C}^d = \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ the local cohomology sheaves $\underline{H}^i_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathcal{G})$ vanish for $i > d$. $\square$

Corollary 4.10. *(a) If $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$, then each complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet_C(\mathcal{F})$ is quasi-isomorphic to a single sheaf $\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F})$ in degree 0, and*

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \left\{ \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(C)=0} \mathcal{E}_C \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(C)=1} \mathcal{E}_C \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \mathcal{E}_0 \right\}$$

is a complex of sheaves on $\mathbb{C}^n$ in the usual sense, quasi-isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}$.

(b) For any $C \in \mathcal{C}$ the functor

$$\mathcal{E}_C : \mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}, \quad \mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F})$$

is an exact functor of abelian categories.

We will call $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ the *Cousin resolution* of $\mathcal{F}$.

Proof: (a) follows from Propositions 4.9(a) and 3.13. Part (b) follows, similarly to Proposition 4.9(b), from the exactness of $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{E}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}}$ on the derived category. □

Definition 4.11. By a *double representation* of the poset $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$ we mean a datum $Q = (E_C, \gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'})$ consisting of finite-dimensional $\mathbf{k}$-vector spaces $E_C, C \in C$ and linear maps

$$\gamma_{C'C} : E_{C'} \to E_C, \quad \delta_{CC'} : E_C \to E_{C'}, \quad C' \leq C,$$

so that $(\gamma_{C'C})$ is a covariant representation and $(\delta_{CC'})$ is a contravariant representation of $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$.

Double representations of $\mathcal{C}$ form an abelian category which we denote $\mathrm{Rep}^2(\mathcal{C})$. This category has a perfect duality

$$Q \mapsto Q^* = (E^*_C, \delta^*_{CC'}, \gamma^*_{C'C}).$$

The results of this sections imply that we have an exact functor

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{Q} : \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}_\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Rep}^2(\mathcal{C}), \\ &\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F}) = \big(E_C(\mathcal{F}), \gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{C'C''}, \delta^{\mathcal{F}}_{CC'}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

commuting with duality. We will call $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$ the *double quiver* associated to the perverse sheaf $\mathcal{F}$.

Let us note the following converse to Proposition 4.9.

Proposition 4.13. *Let $\mathcal{F} \in D^b_{\mathcal{S}^{(0)}} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ be an $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-constructible complex such that each $E^\bullet_C(\mathcal{F})$, $C \in \mathcal{C}$, is quasi-isomorphic to a single vector space in degree 0. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is perverse.*

Proof: Our assumptions imply that we have a Cousin resolution $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ of $\mathcal{F}$ as in Corollary 4.10. So it is enough to show that $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ satisfies (P^-) and (P^+). By construction, $\mathcal{E}^P(\mathcal{F})$ is supported un the union of the $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $\mathrm{codim}(C) = p$. Therefore $\underline{H}^p(\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}))$ is supported on the union of complex flats $L_{\mathbb{C}}$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$ which are contained in the above union of the $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$. Each such L must have codimension $\geq p$. So $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}) \sim \mathcal{F}$ satisfies (P^-). Now, look at $\mathcal{F}^\bigstar$. The double quiver corresponding to $\mathcal{F}^\bigstar$, being, by Proposition 4.6, identified with $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})^*$, also consists of single vector spaces in degree 0. Therefore the above reasoning shows that $\mathcal{F}^\bullet$ satisfies (P^-) and so $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies (P^+) and so is perverse. □

C. Relation to earlier works. (1) Suppose $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{C}$. By the Riemann-Hilbert correspondence, any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ can be represented as the solution sheaf of a a holonomic $\mathcal{D}$-module $\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathbb{C}^n$:

$$\mathcal{F} = \underline{R\,\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{C}^n}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n}).$$

In this case one can give another, analytic proof of Proposition 4.9. Indeed, the complex $\mathcal{R}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{R}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}} = \underline{R\,\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{C}^n}}(\mathcal{M}, \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n}))[n].$$

By the classical result of Sato [32]

$$\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n})[n] \;\sim\; \underline{H}^n_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}^n}) = j_*\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{or}(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad j : \mathbb{R}^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$$

reduces to the sheaf of hyperfunctions $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$, so

$$\mathcal{R}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}} = \underline{R\,\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{C}^n}}(\mathcal{M}, j_*\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{or}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

is the complex of hyperfunction solutions of $\mathcal{M}$. The fact that this complex reduces to a single sheaf, follows from the result of Lebeau [26] (see [20] for the proof of a more general statement) which implies that under our assumptions, $\underline{\mathrm{Ext}}^q_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{C}^n}}(\mathcal{M}, j_*\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n}) = 0$ for $q > 0$. So $\mathcal{R}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}}$ is quasi-isomorphic to the sheaf of hyperfunction solutions of $\mathcal{M}$ in the non-derived sense.

In particular, $E_0(\mathcal{F}) = (\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}})_0 = \Gamma(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}})$ is the space of global hyperfunction solutions of $\mathcal{M}$, and its dimension was found by Takeuchi [37] to be

the sum of multiplicities of $\mathcal{F}$ (or $\mathcal{M}$) along all the possible components of the characteristic variety:

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} E_0(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}} \mathrm{mult}_{T^*_L\mathbb{C}^n}\,\mathcal{F}.$$

This generalizes the classical index formula of Kashiwara-Komatsu in dimension 1, see [21, Th.4.2.7] [25]. See also [36], Th. 1.2, for a generalization to arrangements of non-linear analytic subvarieties.

More generally, for any $C \in \mathcal{C}$ we deduce, by passing to the transverse slice to $\mathbb{L}(C)$, that

$$\dim\, E_C(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \sum_{L\in\mathcal{L}\ \text{s.t.}\ C\subset L} \mathrm{mult}_{T^*_{L_{\mathbb{C}}}\mathbb{C}^n}\,\mathcal{F}.$$

See §??? for a discussion of low-dimensional cases and identification of the $E_C(\mathcal{F})$ in these cases, in terms of the standard functors of nearby and vanishing cycles.

(2) The vector spaces $E_C(\mathcal{F})$ are the same as the spaces of "generalized vanishing cycles" introduced in [3], Part I, §3.3. Our Proposition 4.9 corresponds to Theorem 3.9 of [3], Part I, which says that the complexes of generalized vanishing cycles reduce to single vector spaces, while the part of Proposition 4.6 pertaining to the spaces E_C, corresponds to Theorem 3.5 of [3], Part I. Note that in our approach the more immediate maps among the E_C are the $\gamma_{C'C}$, while in [3], Part I, §3.11 it is the $\delta_{CC'}$ (the "variation maps").

5 Functorialities of the double quiver

A. Hyperbolic restriction. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}$ be a flat of $\mathcal{H}$ of codimension d. Consider the embeddings

$$L_{\mathbb{C}} = L + iL \xrightarrow{k} \mathbb{R}^n + iL \xrightarrow{j} \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Recall that L carries the induced arrangement $\mathcal{H} \cap L$ with poset of faces $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}\cap L} \simeq \mathcal{C}^{\leq L}$ naturally a subposet of $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}}$. We have therefore the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C}^{\leq L}), \quad \mathcal{Q} \mapsto \mathcal{Q}^{\leq L},$$

which takes a double quiver $\mathcal{Q} = (E_C, \gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'})$ to its subdiagram involving only C', C which are contained in L.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ be an $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smooth perverse sheaf with double quiver $\mathcal{Q}$. Then $k^*j^!\mathcal{F}[-d]$ is an object of $\mathrm{Perv}(L_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathcal{H} \cap L)$, and its associated double quiver is $\mathcal{Q}^{\leq L}$.*

Remark 5.2. The statement about perversity of $k^*j^!\mathcal{F}[-d]$ can be seen as an instance of a real analytic version of the main result of Braden [7] (see also [11] for a more in-depth treatment). It can be proved by adapting the methods of [7, 11] and realizing $L_{\mathbb{C}}$ as the fixed point locus of the action of the real group $\mathbb{R}^*_{>0}$ which delates the real part and contracts the imaginary part of the complex normal bundle to $L_{\mathbb{C}}$. Here we give an easy proof based on our analysis of perverse sheaves. Extending the terminology of [7], we will call the perverse sheaf $k^*j^!\mathcal{F}[-d]$ the *hyperbolic restriction* of $\mathcal{F}$ to $L_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Proof of Proposition 5.1: First, we notice that $k^*j^!\mathcal{F}$ is an $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smooth constructible complex on $L_{\mathbb{C}}$. This follows at once from the standard results describing the singular support of the inverse image of an $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaf [23]. Thus $k^*j^!\mathcal{F}[-d]$ can be described by a double quiver of complexes of vector spaces, and we analyze this double quiver.

Recall that $\mathcal{F}$ is represented by its Cousin resolution $\mathcal{E}^\bullet = \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ with $\mathcal{E}^p$ being the direct sum if cellular sheaves $\mathcal{E}_C$ for C running over faces of $\mathcal{H}$ of codimension p.

If $C \subset L$, then $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$, the support of $\mathcal{E}_C$, is contained in $\mathbb{R}^n + iL$, the source of j. Therefore $j^!\mathcal{E}_C = j^*\mathcal{E}_C$ and so

$$k^*j^!\mathcal{E} \;=\; k^*j^*\mathcal{E}_C \;=\; (\mathcal{E}_C)|_{L_{\mathbb{C}}}.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{E}_C = \overline{p}_C^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\mathrm{red}}$, where $\mathcal{E}_C^{\mathrm{red}}$ is a cellular sheaf of $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$ given by the spaces $E_K, K \geq C$ from $\mathcal{Q}$ and their γ-maps. So the restriction $(\mathcal{E}_C)|_{L_\mathbb{C}}$ is a similar pullback of the restriction of $\mathcal{E}_C^{\mathrm{red}}$ to $L/\mathbb{L}(C)$, which is given by the E_K for $C \leq K \subset L$, so the proposition is true in the case $C \subset L$.

If $C \not\subset L$, then $j^! \mathcal{E} = 0$. Indeed, the embedding $\overline{L} \cap L \hookrightarrow \overline{C}$ is a homotopy equivalence. On the other hand, $\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n + iL}(\mathcal{E}_C)$ fits into an exact triangle with two other terms being $\underline{R\Gamma}$ of the pullback of $\mathcal{E}_C^{\mathrm{red}}$ along a trivial fibration with fiber $\overline{C}$ and along the sub-fibration with fiber $\overline{C} \cap L$, and the arrow relating them is a quasi-isomorphism from the homotopy equivalence property.

We conclude that $k^* j^! \mathcal{E}^\bullet[-d]$ is an $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-constructible complex given by the double quiver $\mathcal{Q}^{\leq L}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}^{\leq L}$ consists of single vector spaces (not just complexes), Proposition 4.13 implies that $k^* j^! \mathcal{F}[-d]$ is perverse. □

B. Transversal slice. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}$ be as before. The normal bundle $N_{L/\mathbb{R}^n}$ is canonically trivialized, with fiber $\mathbb{R}^n/L$. Recall that $\mathbb{R}^n/L$ carries the quotient arrangement $\mathcal{H}/L$. Choose a face $C \subset L$ open in L. Then the projection $\overline{\pi}_C : \mathcal{C}^{\geq C} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}/L}$ identifies $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{H}/L}$ with the subposet $\mathcal{C}^{\geq C} \subset \mathcal{C}$. This leads to another restriction functor

$$\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C}^{\geq C}), \quad \mathcal{Q} \mapsto \mathcal{Q}^{\geq C},$$

defined similarly to that in §A.

As before, suppose given $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ with double quiver $\mathcal{Q}$. We have then the *Verdier specialization* $\mathrm{Sp}_{L_\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F})$, see [23] for background. It is a perverse sheaf on (the total space of) the normal bundle $N_{L_\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{C}^n} = L_\mathbb{C} \times (\mathbb{C}^n/L_\mathbb{C})$. Choose some point $c \in C$ (this choice will be immaterial) and let $N_c \simeq \mathbb{C}^n/L_\mathbb{C}$ be the fiber of the above normal bundle over c. We can think of N_c as a transversal slice to $L_\mathbb{C}$ at c. Note that N_c is transverse to the characteristic variety of $\mathrm{Sp}_{L_\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F})$, and so we have the perverse sheaf

$$\mathcal{F}|_{N_c} \ := \ \mathrm{Sp}_{L_\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F})|_{N_c} \ \in \ \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n/L_\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{H}/L).$$

Proposition 5.3. *The double quiver of $\mathcal{F}|_{N_c}$ is identified with $\mathcal{Q}^{\geq C}$.*

Proof: Let $T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an affine subspace forming a transversal slice to L at c. We consider T as an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space with origin c. Then the composition $T \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n/L$ is an isomorphism of vector spaces. To understand the specialization $\mathrm{Sp}_{L_\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F})$ and the perverse sheaf $\mathcal{F}|_{N_c}$, we use the Cousin resolution $\mathcal{E}^\bullet = \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ and analyze $\mathrm{Sp}_{L_\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{E}_K)$ for each summand $\mathcal{E}_K$ of each term

of $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$. We claim that

$$\mathrm{Sp}_{L_{\mathbb{C}}}(\mathcal{E}_K) \;=\; \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_{\overline{\pi}_C(K)}(\mathrm{Sp}_{L_{\mathbb{C}}}(\mathcal{F})), & \text{if } K \geq C, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

Indeed, the small neighborhood of the origin in $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ meets only those closures of tube cells $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{K}$, for which $K \geq C$. If $K \geq C$, the statement follows from the fact that $T_{\mathbb{C}}$ is transversal to the characteristic varieties of all the sheaves involved and therefore taking cohomology with support commutes with restriction to $T_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Now, the statement about the double quiver of $\mathcal{F}|_{N_c}$ follows from (5.4) immediately. □

6 The double quiver determines a perverse sheaf

The goal of section is to prove the following preliminary result.

Theorem 6.1. *The functor* $\mathcal{Q} : \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}) \to \mathrm{Rep}^2(\mathcal{C})$ *from* (4.12) *is fully faithful.*

A. Orthogonality relations. For an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ let $C^b\mathcal{A}$ be the abelian category formed by bounded complexes over $\mathcal{A}$ and morphisms of complexes (not homotopy classes) in the usual sense. We start with

Proposition 6.2. *The Cousin resolution functor*

$$\mathcal{E}^\bullet : \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow C^b \operatorname{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}, \quad \mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}),$$

is fully faithful.

Proof: The fact that $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ is injective on morphisms follows because $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F}) \sim \mathcal{F}$ (Corollary 4.10). To show that it is surjective on morphisms, we establish a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})) \;\simeq\; \mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F}). \tag{6.3}$$

This is an immediate consequence of the following "orthogonality relations".

Lemma 6.4. *Let* $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}_\mathbb{C})$. *For any* $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$ *we have*

$$\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n + iC'} \mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F}), & \text{if } C' = C; \\ 0, & \text{if } C' \neq C. \end{cases}$$

Proof of the lemma: If $C' \not\leq C$, then $C' \cap \overline{C} = \emptyset$ and so

$$\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n + iC'}(\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F})) = j_{C*} j_C^!(\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F})) = 0$$

since $\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F})$ is supported on $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$. If $C' = C$, the statement of the lemma is obvious. Suppose $C' < C$ (strict inequality). By Proposition 3.10, $\mathcal{E}_C = \overline{p}_C^* \mathcal{E}_C^{\mathrm{red}}$, where $\mathcal{E}_C^{\mathrm{red}}$ is a cellular sheaf on $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$. In particular, $\mathcal{E}_C$, considered as a sheaf on $\mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}$, is pulled back from a sheaf on $\mathbb{R}^n$. So Lemma 6.4 and Proposition 6.2 are consequences of the following fact.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be any $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaf on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $C' < C$. Let $q_C : \mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be the real part projection. Then $\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n + iC'}(q_C^* \mathcal{G}) = 0$.*

Proof: Note that the embedding $\overline{C} \setminus C' \hookrightarrow \overline{C}$ is a homotopy equivalence. Because of this, for any open $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ the restriction map

$$R\Gamma(\overline{U} + iC, q_C^* \mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow R\Gamma(U + i(\overline{C} \setminus C'), q_C^* \mathcal{G})$$

is a quasi-isomorphism (both complexes are quasi-isomorphic to $R\Gamma(U, \mathcal{G})$). This shows that the complex of sheaves $\underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n + iC'}(q_C^* \mathcal{G})$ is quasi-isomorphc to 0. Lemma 6.4 and Proposition 6.2 are proved. □

B. Recovery of $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ from $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$. To prove Theorem 6.1, it is therefore enough to recover the entire complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{F})$ from the double quiver $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$. By Proposition 3.13, each sheaf $\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F})$ is recovered from the data of $E_D(\mathcal{F})$, $D \geq C$ and of $\gamma_{D'D}$, $C \leq D' \leq D$. So the only remaining data are the matrix elements of the differentials. Eliminating the orientation torsors as in (4.4), we write these matrix elements as morphisms of sheaves

$$\underline{\delta}_{CC'} : \mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{C'}(\mathcal{F}), \quad C' <_1 C. \tag{6.6}$$

Similarly to Proposition 4.5, we have the following fact.

Proposition 6.7. *The morphisms of sheaves $\underline{\delta}_{CC'}$ commute, i.e., extend to a contravariant representation of $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$ in $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$.* □

In other words, we have a well-defined map $\underline{\delta}_{CC'}$ for any inclusion $C' < C$, not necessarily of codimension 1 obtained by composing the "elementary" maps corresponding to codimension 1 inclusions.

The data contained in $\underline{\delta}_{CC'}$ are precisely the induced morphisms on stalks of the sheaves $\mathcal{E}_C, \mathcal{E}_{C'}$ over all the cells $D + iC, D \in \mathcal{C}$, which are linear maps

$$\delta_{CC'|D} : E_{C \circ D} \longrightarrow E_{C' \circ D}. \tag{6.8}$$

So it is enough to express each $\delta_{CC'|D}$ through the γ and δ maps of the double quiver $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{E})$. We start with the following statement.

Proposition 6.9. *For each $C' \leq C$ we have $\gamma_{C'C} \circ \delta_{CC'} = \mathrm{Id}_{E_C}$. In particular, each $\gamma_{C'C}$ is surjective, each $\delta_{CC'}$ is injective and $\dim(E_{C'}) \geq \dim(E_C)$.*

Proof: We use the fact that the maps of stalks induced by the morphism of sheaves $\underline{\delta}_{CC'}$ commute with the generalization maps from $C'+iC'$ to $C+iC'$. This translates into the commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}_C|_{C'+iC'} = E_C & \xrightarrow{\delta_{CC'}=\delta_{CC'|C'}} & E_{C'} = \mathcal{E}_{C'}|_{C+iC'} \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Id}} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \gamma_{C'C}} \\ \mathcal{E}_C|_{C+iC'} = E_C & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{Id}=\delta_{CC'|C}]{} & E_C = \mathcal{E}_{C'}|_{C+iC'}. \end{array}$$

Here Id is the generalization map for $\mathcal{E}_C$ and $\gamma_{C'C}$ is the generalization map for $\mathcal{E}_{C'}$. This gives the statement. □

We now let C, C', D be three arbitrary cells such that $C' \leq C$. Put

$$K = C \circ D \geq C, \quad K' = C' \circ D \geq C'. \tag{6.10}$$

Note that because $\mathcal{E}_C, \mathcal{E}_{C'}$ are pullbacks of sheaves on $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$, resp. $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C')$, we have

$$\delta_{CC'|D} = \delta_{CC'|K'}. \tag{6.11}$$

Theorem 6.1 will be established, if we prove:

Proposition 6.12. *In the described situation, we have*

$$\delta_{CC'|D} = \gamma_{C'K'} \circ \delta_{KC'} : E_K \longrightarrow E_{K'}.$$

Proof: We first use that he maps of stalks induced by the morphism of sheaves $\underline{\delta}_{CC'}$ commute with the generalization maps from $C' + iC'$ to $K + iC'$. This gives the commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_C & \xrightarrow{\delta_{CC'}} & E_{C'} \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \gamma_{CK}} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \gamma_{C'K'}} \\ E_K & \xrightarrow[\delta_{CC'|K'}]{} & E_{K'}, \end{array}$$

i.e., the equality

$$\delta_{CC'|K'} \circ \gamma_{CK} = \gamma_{C'K'} \circ \delta_{CC'}.$$

We precompose this equality with δ_{KC}:

$$\delta_{CC'|K'} \circ \gamma_{CK} \circ \delta_{KC} = \gamma_{C'K'} \circ \delta_{CC'} \circ \delta_{KC}.$$

Now, using on the left, Proposition 6.9, and on the right, the fact that the δ maps form a contravariant representation of $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$, and also invoking (6.11), we get the desired statement. $\square$

Corollary 6.13. *In the above situation, we also have*

$$\delta_{CC'|D} = \gamma_{0K'} \circ \delta_{K0}.$$

7 Algebraic relations in the double quiver

Let

$$\mathcal{Q} = \big((E_C)_{C\in\mathcal{C}}, (\gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'})_{C'\le C}\big) \ \in \ \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C}) \tag{7.1}$$

be a double representation of $\mathcal{C}$. In this section we find algebraic relations among the maps $\gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'}$ which are necessary for $\mathcal{Q}$ to have the form $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$ for some $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$.

Call $\mathcal{Q}$ *monotone*, if $\gamma_{C'C} \circ \delta_{CC'} = \mathrm{Id}$ for any $C' \le C$. By Proposition 6.9, any $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$ is monotone.

Given a monotone $\mathcal{Q}$, for any $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ we define the *transition map*

$$\phi_{AB} = \gamma_{MB} \circ \delta_{AM} : E_A \longrightarrow E_B, \quad M \le A, B. \tag{7.2}$$

By monotonicity, the choice of M is immaterial, for example one can take $M = 0$. Note that ϕ_{AB} is equal to γ_{AB}, if $A \le B$, and to δ_{AB}, if $A \ge B$.

Definition 7.3. Three chambers $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ are called *collinear*, if there are $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$ such that $b \in [a, c]$, i.e., b lies on the straight line segment between a and c.

Collinearity is recovered from the oriented matroid corresponding to $\mathcal{H}$. More precisely:

Proposition 7.4. *Let us introduce a total order $\preceq$ on $\{+, -, 0\}$ which is induced by the standard order on $\mathbb{R}$, i.e., by $- \preceq 0 \preceq +$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) The chambers A, B, C are collinear.

(ii) For each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ the sequence of sign vectors (A_H, B_H, C_H) is monotone increasing or decreasing: either $A_H \preceq B_H \preceq C_H$, or $C_H \preceq B_H \preceq A_H$.

Proof: (i)⇒(ii) is obvious. To see the converse, suppose that three cells A, B, C are *not* collinear. Then there is a hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that B lies on one side of H and A, C lie on the other side. This contradicts the monotonicity of (A_H, B_H, C_H). □

Theorem 7.5 (Transitivity relations)**.** *Let $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$ for some $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$. Then for any collinear chambers A, B, C we have*

$$\phi_{AC} = \phi_{BC} \circ \phi_{AB} : E_A \longrightarrow E_C.$$

Remark 7.6 (Transitivity: long form). By marking all the chambers meeting $[a, c]$, we get a cell path (alternating sequence of inclusions)

$$A = B_1 \geq B'_1 < B_2 < B'_2 > \cdots < B_{m-1} > B'_{m-1} \leq B_m = C$$

(there are 4 possibilities as to whether $A = B'_1$ or $B'_m = C$). By iterating Theorem 7.5, we can reformulate in in the equivalent form:

$$\phi_{AC} = \gamma_{B'_{m-1}B_m} \circ \delta_{B_{m-1}B'_{m-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \delta_{B'_1B_2} \circ \delta_{B_1B'_1}.$$

Note that it may be possible that A and C can be connected by a straight line segment in more than one inequivalent way, in which case ϕ_{AC} can be expressible through the γ and δ maps in more than one way, producing additional algebraic relations in $\mathcal{Q}$, see Example 7.9 below.

Example 7.7 (Base change). It is sometimes convenient to view the poset $\mathcal{C}$ as a category, that is, to write an inclusion $C' \leq C$ as a morphism $u : C' \to C$. Then a double representation $\mathcal{Q}$ can be viewed as a "bivariant theory" on $\mathcal{C}$: for a morphism u as above, we write

$$u_* = \gamma_{C'C},\ u^* = \delta_{CC'}.$$

In this language, a simplest instance of Theorem 7.5 can be viewed as a "base change property": we consider a (necessarily commutative) square of chamber inclusions

(7.8)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} D & \xrightarrow{v_1} & A \\ {\scriptstyle v_2}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u_1} \\ C & \xrightarrow[u_2]{} & B. \end{array}$$

The condition that A, B, C are collinear, means that the square is coCartesian in the categorical sense: B is the minimal chamber containing A and C in its closure. In this case, Theorem 7.5 says that

$$v_{2*}v_1^* = u_2^*u_{1*} : E_A \longrightarrow E_C.$$

Indeed, the LHS is ϕ_{AC}, while $u_{1*} = \gamma_{AB} = \phi_{AB}$ and $u_2^* = \delta_{BC} = \phi_{BC}$.

Example 7.9 (Zifferblatt relations). Another extreme instance of Theorem 7.5 corresponds to the case when $C = -A$ is the opposite cell to



Figure 2: The Zifferblatt.

A. Suppose $\dim(A) \geq 2$, and let L be a 2-dimensional subspace such that $\dim(L \cap A) = 2$. The arrangement $\mathcal{H} \cap L$ then cuts $L \setminus \{0\}$ into some even number $2m$ of 2-dimensional open cones, which we number cyclically $\overline{B}_1, \cdots, \overline{B}_{2m}$ and the same number of 1-dimensional open rays $\overline{B}'_1, \cdots, \overline{B}'_{2m}$. Let B_ν, B'_ν be the chambers of $\mathcal{C}$ which intersect L in $\overline{B}_\nu, \overline{B}'_\nu$, see Fig.2.

Note that there are two inequivalent ways to join a point of A with a point of C by a straight line segment inside L not passing through 0, represented by the segments $[a, c]$ and $[a', c']$ in Fig. 2. So the long form of the transitivity relations (Remark 7.6) gives the *Zifferblatt relation* (we borrow the term from [28]):

$$\gamma_{B'_{m-1}C} \circ \delta_{B_{m-1}B'_{m-1}} \circ \gamma_{B'_{m-2}B_{m-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \delta_{B_2B'_2} \circ \gamma_{B'_1B_2} \circ \delta_{AB'_1} =$$
$$= \gamma_{B'_mC} \circ \delta_{B_{m+1}B'_m} \circ \gamma_{B'_{m+1}B_{m+1}} \circ \cdots \circ \delta_{B_{2m}B'_{2m-1}} \circ \gamma_{B'_{2m}B_{2m}} \circ \delta_{AB'_{2m}}$$

(both sides of this equality are equal to $\phi_{AC} = \gamma_{0C} \circ \delta_{A0}$).

The rest of this section will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 7.5.

Step 1: Base change. We first consider the situation of a coCartesian square from Example 7.7, as it will serve as an inductive step in treating more general cases. The assumption that A, B, C are collinear implies that $C \circ A = B$.

Lemma 7.10. *In the situation of Example 7.7, the map*

$$\delta_{AD|C} : E_{C\circ A} = E_B \longrightarrow E_C = E_{C\circ D}$$

is equal to δ_{BC}.

Proof of the lemma: We consider the commutative square of the $\mathcal{E}$-sheaves corresponding to (7.8) and the corresponding commutative square of stalks over $C + iD$. These squares have the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}_D & \xleftarrow{\underline{\delta}_{AD}} & \mathcal{E}_A \\ {\scriptstyle \underline{\delta}_{CD}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \underline{\delta}_{BA}} \\ \mathcal{E}_C & \xleftarrow[\underline{\delta}_{BC}]{} & \mathcal{E}_B, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} E_C & \xleftarrow{\delta_{AD|C}} & E_B \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{Id}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Id}} \\ E_C & \xleftarrow[\delta_{BC}]{} & E_B, \end{array}$$

whence the lemma. □

To deduce our particular case of Theorem 7.5 from the lemma, we spell out the condition that the maps of stalks induced by $\underline{\delta}_{AD}$ commute with generalization from $D + iD$ to $C + iD$. This gives a commutative square of vector spaces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_B & \xrightarrow{\delta_{AD|C}=\delta_{BC}} & E_C \\ {\scriptstyle \gamma_{AB}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \gamma_{DC}} \\ E_A & \xrightarrow[\delta_{AD|D}=\delta_{AD}]{} & E_D \end{array}$$

in which the path through E_D gives, as the composite map, ϕ_{AC} while the path through E_B consists of $\delta_{BC} = \phi_{BC}$ and $\gamma_{AB} = \phi_{AB}$.

Step 2: Case when $C \neq -A$. In this case the segment $[a, c]$ does not pass through 0 and so its $\mathbb{R}$-linear span is a 2-dimensional subspace $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. As in Example 7.9, we then have an induced arrangement $\mathcal{H} \cap L$ of lines in L, and there are various possibilities as to whether the chambers

$$\overline{A} = A \cap L,\ \overline{B} = B \cap L,\ \overline{C} = C \cap L$$

have dimension 1 or 2. We first consider the case $\dim(\overline{A}) = 2$, depicted in Fig. 3. Denote by $\overline{A}'_1, \overline{A}'_2$ the two rays bordering $\overline{A}$ so that $\overline{A}'_2$ meets $[a, c]$. Further, denote $\overline{D}$ the next 2-dimensional cell in the direction from a to c. Let $D, A'_1, A'_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ be the chambers whose intersections with L are $\overline{D}, \overline{A}'_1, \overline{A}'_2$. Our assumption that $C \neq -A$ implies that the intersection with L of all the chambers meeting $[a, c]$ lie on the same side of the line $\mathbb{L}(A'_1)$.

Consider the square of inclusions $0 \leq A'_1, A'_2 \leq A$. Let us write the corresponding commutative squares of $\mathcal{E}$-sheaves and of stalks of these sheaves



Figure 3: Case $C \neq -A$.

at $C = C + i0$. The latter square has the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}_A\big|_C = E_A & \xrightarrow{\text{Id}} & E_A = E_{A'_1 \circ C} = \mathcal{E}_{A'_1}\big|_C \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_{AD}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_{AC}} \\ \mathcal{E}_{A'_2}\big|_C = E_{A'_2 \circ C} = E_D & \xrightarrow[\phi_{DC}]{} & \mathcal{E}_0\big|_C = E_C, \end{array}$$

so $\phi_{AC} = \phi_{DC}\phi_{AD}$. Similarly, by considering the commutative square of stalks over iB, we find that $\phi_{AB} = \phi_{DB}\phi_{BC}$. Therefore we reduce to proving that $\phi_{DC} = \phi_{DB}\phi_{DB}$ which can be further reduced in a similar way. So proceeding by induction, we reduce the situation to the case $B = A$ or $B = A'_2$. If $B = A$, there is nothing to prove. If $B = A'_2$, then

$$\phi_{AC} = \gamma_{0C}\delta_{A0} = \gamma_{0C}\delta_{B0}\delta_{AB} = \phi_{BC}\delta_{AB} = \phi_{BC}\phi_{AB}.$$

This concludes the treatment of the case $\dim(\overline{A}) = 2$.

The case when $\dim(\overline{A}) = 1$, is analyzed inductively in a similar way, reducing it to the situation of Example 7.7 which has been analyzed in Step 1. This concludes the analysis of Step 2.

Step 3: Case $C = -A$. In this case we use the notation of Example 7.9. We consider the segment $[a, c]$. Note that by Step 2 we have

$$\phi_{B'_1 B'_{m-1}} \;:=\; \gamma_{0B'_{m-1}} \circ \delta_{B'_1 0} \;=\; \delta_{B_{m-1}B'_{m-1}} \circ \gamma_{B'_{m-2}B_{m-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \delta_{B_2 B'_2} \circ \gamma_{B'_1 B_2}.$$

Therefore, using the fact that the γ and δ maps commute with compositions

of inclusions, we have

$$\phi_{AC} \;:=\; \gamma_{0C} \circ \delta_{A0} \;=\; \gamma_{B'_{m-1}C} \circ \gamma_{0B'_{m-1}} \circ \delta_{B'_1 0} \circ \delta_{AB'_1} =$$
$$= \gamma_{B'_{m-1}C} \circ \left(\delta_{B_{m-1}B'_{m-1}} \circ \gamma_{B'_{m-2}B_{m-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \delta_{B_2 B'_2} \circ \gamma_{B'_1 B_2}\right) \circ \delta_{AB'_1},$$

which is the long form of the transitivity relation. The case of the segment $[a', c']$ is treated in the same way.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 7.5.

8 Equivalence of categories

A. The main result. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an arrangement of hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with the poset of faces $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ be the corresponding category of double representations $\mathcal{Q} = (E_C, \gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'})$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} \subset \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ be the full subcategory of double representations satisfying the following three conditions:

(Mon) Monotonicity: $\gamma_{C'C} \circ \delta_{CC'} = \mathrm{Id}$, $C' \leq C$. This allows us to define transition maps $\phi_{AB} = \gamma_{CB} \circ \delta_{AC} : E_A \to E_B$ where C is an arbitrary cell $\leq A, B$.

(Tran) Transitivity: $\phi_{AC} = \phi_{BC} \circ \phi_{AB}$ for any three collinear faces A, B, C.

(Inv) Invertibility: Let C_1, C_2 be two faces of the same dimension d with the same linear span $\mathbb{L}(C_1) = \mathbb{L}(C_2)$, which lie on opposite sides of a face D_1 of dimension $d-1$, so $C_1 >_1 D_1 <_1 C_2$. Then $\phi_{C_1C_2} = \gamma_{D_1C_2}\delta_{C_1D_1} : E_{C_1} \to E_{C_2}$ is an isomorphism.

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 8.1. *The functor $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$ defines an equivalence of categories* $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{A}$.

In view of Theorem 6.1, it suffices to prove the following statement.

Reformulation 8.2. In order for $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ to have the form $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$ for some $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$, it is necessary and sufficient that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies (Mon), (Tran) and (Inv).

The proof will occupy the remainder of this section.

B. Necessity. The necessity of (Mon) and (Tran) has already been proved in Proposition 6.12 and Theorem 7.5. Let us prove the necessity of (Inv). Because of Proposition 5.1, it is enough to consider the case when C_1 and C_2 are faces open in $\mathbb{R}^n$, because the general case will then follow by considering the hyperbolic restriction to $L_{\mathbb{C}}$, where $L = \mathbb{L}(C_1) = \mathbb{L}(C_2)$.

Assuming the C_1 and C_2 are open, consider the Cousin resolution $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ of $\mathcal{F}$. Note that $\mathcal{F}$ is $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smooth, while the summands $\mathcal{E}_C$ of $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ are only $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$-smooth. Look at the $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smooth sheaf

$$\underline{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \mathrm{Ker}\left\{ \bigoplus_{C \text{ open}} \mathcal{E}_C \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\delta}} \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(D)=1} \mathcal{E}_D \right\}.$$

The $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$-cells $[D_1, C_2] \le [C_2, C_2]$ lie in the same stratum $(\mathbb{C}^n)^\circ$ of $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$. Therefore the generalization map for $\underline{H}^0(\mathcal{F})$ from $[D_1, C_2]$ to $[C_2, C_2]$ must be an isomorphism. But, applying Corollary 3.16(c), we find that up to tensuring with $\mathrm{or}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$\underline{H}^0(\mathcal{F})|_{[D_1,C_2]} \;=\; \mathrm{Ker}\big\{E_{C_1} \oplus E_{C_2} \overset{\phi_{C_1C_2}-\mathrm{Id}}{\longrightarrow} E_{C_2}\big\},$$
$$\underline{H}^0(\mathcal{F})_{[C_2,C_2]} \;=\; E_{C_2},$$

and the generalization map is induced by the projection $E_{C_1} \oplus E_{C_2} \to E_{C_2}$. In order for this projection to restrict to an isomorphism $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi_{C_1C_2} - \mathrm{Id}) \to E_{C_2}$, the map $\phi_{C_1C_2}$ must be an isomorphism.

C. Sufficiency: construction of the complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$. To prove the sufficiency of the three conditions in Reformulation 8.2, we start with as double representation $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfying them, construct a complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet = \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})$ and then prove that it is a perverse sheaf with double quiver $\mathcal{Q}$.

In this procedure, the *construction* of the complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})$ will rely only on the properties (Mon) and (Tran), while (Inv) will be needed to ensure that this complex is an object of $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$.

As the first step, we *define* the sheaves $\mathcal{E}_C = \mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{Q})$ by the formulas of Proposition 3.13, and then, for any cells $C' \le C$ and D, define the map

$$\delta_{CC'|D} = \delta^{\mathcal{Q}}_{CC'|D} : E_{\mathrm{Lift}_C(D)} \longrightarrow E_{\mathrm{Lift}_{C'}(D)}$$

by the formulas of Proposition 6.12.

Proposition 8.3. *The $\delta_{CC'|D}$ commute with the generalization maps and so define morphisms of sheaves*

$$\underline{\delta}_{CC'} : \mathcal{E}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{C'}, \quad C' \le C.$$

Proof: For any cells $C' \le C$, $D' \le D$ we need to prove the commutativity of the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_{C'\circ D'} & \xleftarrow{\delta_{CC'|D'}} & E_{C\circ D'} \\ {\scriptstyle \gamma_{C'\circ D', C'\circ D}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \gamma_{C\circ D', C\circ D}} \\ E_{C'\circ D} & \xleftarrow[\delta_{CC'|D}]{} & E_{C\circ D}. \end{array}$$

In order to do this, we use the bivariant notation of Example 7.7, and consider the diagram of inclusions depicted by arrows



Then

$$\gamma_{C'\circ D', C'\circ D} \circ \delta_{CC'|D} \;=\; v'_* \circ (w'_* s^* w^*) \;=\; u'_* s^* w^*,$$
$$\delta_{CC'|D} \circ \gamma_{C\circ D', C\circ D} \;=\; (u'_* s^* u^*) \circ v_*.$$

But by monotonicity,

$$w^* = w^*(v^* v_*) = u^* v_*,$$

so the two compositions are equal. □

Proposition 8.4. *If a monotone $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies (Tran), then the morphisms of sheaves $\underline{\delta}_{CC'}$, $C' \leq C$, commute with each other, i.e., give rise to a contravariant representation of $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$ in* $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$.

Proof: We have to prove the identity

$$\phi_{K'_1 K''} \circ \phi_{K K'_1} = \phi_{K'_2 K''} \circ \phi_{K K'_2} : E_K \longrightarrow E_{K''} \tag{8.5}$$

for any four cells K, K'_1, K'_2, K'' with the following property: there exists a square of codimension 1 inclusions

$$C >_1 C'_1, C'_2 >_1 C''$$

and a cell $D \leq C''$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} K = C \circ D, \quad K'' = C'' \circ D, \\ K'_1 = C'_1 \circ D, \quad K'_2 = C'_2 \circ D. \end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

This would correspond to the commutativity of the stalks of the square



over the cell $[C'', D]$. Note that the $[C'', D]$ for $D \geq C''$, form a cell decomposition of the tube cell $\mathbb{R}^n + iC''$, and the sheaves in question are direct image extensions of some sheaves from tube cells to their closures, so checking the commutative of the above square over

$$\mathbb{R}^n + iC'' \ \subset \ \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{E}_{C''}) \ = \ \mathbb{R}^n + i\overline{C}''$$

is enough.

To prove (8.5), we consider first the case when $D \not\subset \mathbb{L}(C)$. In this case, using the interpretation of the compositions in eq:4-compos via straight line intervals as in Proposition 2.3(b), we find that $K \geq K'_1, K'_2 \geq K''$, and so the ϕ-maps in (8.5) reduce to the δ-maps of $\mathcal{Q}$ which satisfy commutativity by definition of $\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$.

We assume therefore that $D \subset \mathbb{L}(C)$. We can further assume, by working with the restricted double quiver $\mathcal{Q}^{\leq \mathbb{L}(C)}$, then $\mathbb{L}(C) = \mathbb{R}^n$ is the ambient space of our arrangement, so C is open in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Since $D \geq C'$, we have $K'' = D$. Since C is open and $K = C \circ D \geq C$, we have $K = C$. We can depict the inclusion structure of our cells by arrows as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K = C & \longleftarrow & C'_1 & \longrightarrow & K'_1 \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ K'_2 & \longleftarrow & C'_2 & \longleftarrow & C'' \longrightarrow K'' = D. \end{array}$$

Choose some points $d \in D$, $c'_\nu \in C'_\nu$, $\nu = 1, 2..$ Let $k'_\nu \in [c'_\nu, d]$ be a small displacement of c'_ν towards d. By Proposition 2.3(b), K'_ν is the cell containing k'_ν. Therefore the cells C'_ν, K'_ν, D are collinear. So by transitivity,

$$\phi_{C'_\nu D} \ = \ \phi_{K'_\nu D}\phi_{C'_\nu K'_\nu} \ = \ \phi_{K'_\nu D}\gamma_{C'_\nu K'_\nu}.$$

Therefore the LHS of (8.5) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{K'_1 D}\phi_{CK'_1} \ &= \ \phi_{K'_1 D}\gamma_{C'_1 K'_1}\delta_{CC'_1} \ = \\ = \ \phi_{C'_1 D}\delta_{CC'_1} \ &= \ \gamma_{C'' D}\delta_{C'_1 C''}\delta_{CC'_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the RHS of (8.5) is equal to $\gamma_{C'' D}\delta_{C'_2 C''}\delta_{CC'_2}$, and our statement follows from the commutativity of the δ-maps in $\mathcal{Q}$.

D. The complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})$ is $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smooth: inclusions of type (1). Proposition 8.4 implies that we have a complex of sheaves $\mathcal{E}^\bullet = \mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})$ with

$$\mathcal{E}^p(\mathcal{Q}) \ = \ \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(C)=p} \mathcal{E}_C \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)$$

and the differential $\widetilde{\underline{\delta}}$ given by the $\underline{\delta}_{CC'}$ and satisfying $\widetilde{\underline{\delta}}^2 = 0$. By construction, each summand of $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ and thus $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ itself, is $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$-smooth.

Proposition 8.7. *The complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet$ is $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-smooth.*

Proof: By Proposition 3.3, it is enough to show that for any elementary inclusion $[C_1, D_1] \leq [C_2, D_2]$ of $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$-cells, the generalization map

$$\gamma_{[C_1,D_1],[C_2,D_2]} : \mathcal{E}^\bullet|_{[C_1,D_1]} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}^\bullet_{[C_2,D_2]}$$

is a quasi-iosomorphism of complexes of vector spaces. We first consider an inclusion of type (1)

$$[C_1, D] \leq [C_2, D], \quad C_1 <_1 C_2 \leq D.$$

Lemma 8.8. *$\gamma_{[C_1,D],[C_2,D]}$ is a surjective morphism of complexes of vector spaces, with kernel*

$$K^\bullet = \left\{ \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathrm{codim}(C)=0 \\ C \geq C_1, C \not\geq C_2}} E_{C \circ D} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\underline{\delta}}} \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathrm{codim}(C)=1 \\ C \geq C_1, C \not\geq C_2}} E_{C \circ D} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C) \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\underline{\delta}}} \cdots \right\},$$

where $\widetilde{\underline{\delta}}$ has, as matrix elements, the $\delta_{CC'}$ for relevant C, C' tensured with the coorientations of the adjacent cells.

Proof: Recall that we defined the sheaf $\mathcal{E}_C$ by forcing the formulas of Corollary 3.16(c). Therefore the stalk $\mathcal{E}_C|_{[C_1,D]}$ is equal to $E_{C \circ D}$, if $C \geq C_1$ and to 0, if $C \not\geq C_1$, and similarly for $\mathcal{E}_C|_{[C_2,D]}$. The generalization maps were also defined by formulas of Corollary 3.16(c). This implies that the matrix elements of $\gamma_{C_1,D],[C_2,D]}$ are either Id or 0, whence our statement. □

We need therefore to prove that $K^\bullet$ is an exact complex.

Lemma 8.9. *Consider the increasing filtration F of $K^\bullet$ by graded subspaces defined by*

$$F_d K^p = \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathrm{codim}(C)+p \\ C \geq C_1, C \not\geq C_2 \\ \dim(C \circ D) \leq d}} E_{C \circ D} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C).$$

This filtration is compatible with the differential $\widetilde{\delta}$.

Proof: The matrix element $\widetilde{\delta}_{CC'}$ is nonzero only if $C' \le C$. In this case $\mathbb{L}(C' \circ D) \subset \mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$ by Proposition 2.7(b), and so $\dim(C' \circ D) \le \dim(C \circ D)$. $\square$

We are therefore reduced to proving that each $\mathrm{gr}_d^F K^\bullet$ is exact.

Lemma 8.10. *Fix $d \ge 0$ and consider all d-dimensional flats $M \in \mathcal{I}$ containing C_1. Let*

$$(\mathrm{gr}_d^F K)^p_M \;=\; \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathrm{codim}(C)=p \\ C \ge C_1, C \not\ge C_2 \\ \mathbb{L}(C \circ D)=M}} E_{C \circ D} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C).$$

Then $(\mathrm{gr}_d^F K)^\bullet_M$ is a subcomplex in $\mathrm{gr}_d^F K^\bullet$, and we have a decomposition into a direct sum of complexes

$$\mathrm{gr}_d^F K^\bullet \;=\; \bigoplus_{M \supset C_1} (\mathrm{gr}_d^F K)^\bullet_M.$$

Proof: Look at a summand $E_{C \circ D} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)$ with

$$\mathrm{codim}(C) = p,\ C \ge C_1,\ C \not\ge C_2,\ \dim(C \circ D) = d.$$

The differential in $\mathrm{gr}_d^F K^\bullet$ can take this summand only to summands of the form $E_{C' \circ D}$, where

$$C' <_1 C,\ \mathrm{codim}(C) = p+1,\ C' \ge C_1,\ C' \not\ge C_2,\ \dim(C' \circ D) = d.$$

Since $\mathbb{L}(C' \circ D) \subset \mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$ by Proposition 2.7(b) and $\dim\mathbb{L}(C' \circ D) = \dim\mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$, we conclude that $\mathbb{L}(C' \circ D) = \mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$. So the complex $\mathrm{gr}_D^F K^\bullet$ splits into a direct sum of sub complexes corresponding to all possible values of $M = \mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$. $\square$

Denote $G^\bullet_M = (\mathrm{gr}_d^F K)^\bullet_M$. We are reduced therefore to proving that $G^\bullet_M$ is exact for each M. So we fix M and note that by the above

$$G^p_M \;=\; \bigoplus_{\substack{\mathrm{codim}(C)=p \\ M \supset C \ge C_1,\ C \not\ge C_2 \\ C \circ D \text{ open in } M}} E_{C \circ D} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C).$$

Note that we can represent $G^\bullet_M$ as the quotient $G^\bullet_{1,M}/G^\bullet_{2,M}$, where $G^p_{1,M}$ is the direct sum as above but without the restriction $C \not\ge C_2$, and $G^p_{2,M}$ is a similar

direct sum but with the additional restriction $C \geq C_2$. So we are reduced to proving that the embedding $G^\bullet_{2,M} \hookrightarrow G^\bullet_{1,M}$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

In order that the summand corresponding to a face C to be present in $G^p_{1,M}$, it necessary that not only $C \subset M$, but also that $D \subset M$, since $M = \mathbb{L}(C \circ D)$ is the minimal flat of $\mathcal{H}$ containing $\mathbb{L}(C)$ and $\mathbb{L}(D)$. This means that $G^\bullet_{1,M}$ (as well as $G^\bullet_{2,M}$) is entirely described in terms of faces of $\mathcal{H}$ contained in M, i.e., in terms of the restricted double quver $\mathcal{Q}^{\leq M}$. So by passing to the restricted configuration $\mathcal{H} \cap M$, if necessary, we can and will assume that $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, and write $G^\bullet_\nu = G^\bullet_\nu, \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nu = 1, 2$. Further, since C runs over faces containing C_1, the $G^\bullet_\nu$ are entirely described in terms of the restricted double quiver $\mathcal{Q}^{\geq C_1}$. So by passing to the quotient configuration if necessary, we can and will assume that $C_1 = \{0\}$, and therefore $\dim(C_2) = 1$.

Under all these assumptions, let us give a geometric interpretation of the $G^\bullet_\nu$. Let $\mathcal{C}_D \subset \mathcal{C}$ be the set of faces C such that $C \circ D$ is open in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $|\mathcal{C}_D|$ be the union of cells from $\mathcal{C}_D$. Note that each matrix element of the differential in $G^\bullet_1$ is either 0 or an isomorphism obtained as a composition of the invertible transition maps from the condition (Inv). These invertible maps define a cellular locally constant sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ on $|\mathcal{C}_D|$, and

$$\mathcal{G}^\bullet_1 \;=\; C^{\mathrm{cell}}_\bullet(|\mathcal{C}_D|, \mathcal{G})[n]$$

is the standard cellular chain complex of $\mathcal{G}$ shifted to so as to start in degree 0 (and to have differential of degree +1). Similarly, let $\mathcal{C}_D^{\geq C_2}$ be the subposet in $\mathcal{C}_D$ formed by C satisfying $C \geq C_2$ and $|\mathcal{C}_D^{\geq C_2}|$ be the union of cells from this subposet. Then

$$\mathcal{G}^\bullet_2 \;=\; C^{\mathrm{cell}}_\bullet(|\mathcal{C}_D^{\geq C_2}|, \mathcal{G})[n].$$

Therefore, the acyclicity of $G^\bullet_1/G^\bullet_2$ will follow if we prove that the embedding of spaces $|\mathcal{C}_D^{\geq C_2}| \hookrightarrow |\mathcal{C}_D|$ is a homotopy equivalence.

Lemma 8.11. *Let $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $C \circ D$ is open in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(ii) C does not lie in any hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{H}$ containing D.

Proof: We recall the interpretation of $C \circ D$ in terms of the projection $\pi_C : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$ given in Proposition 2.6. That is, $C \circ D$ is the unique cell from $\mathcal{C}^{\geq}C$ which projects onto $\sigma(\pi_C(D))$, the cell of $\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)$ containing $\pi_C(D)$. So for $C \circ D$ to be open in $\mathbb{R}^n$, it is necessary and sufficient that

$\sigma(\pi_C(D))$ be open in $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{L}(C)$. This means that $\pi_C(D)$ does not lie in any hyperplane of $\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(C)$, i.e., D does not lie in any hyperplane of $\mathcal{H}$ containing C. In other words, the sets of hyperplanes of $\mathcal{H}$ containing C and D, must be disjoint. □

The above lemma implies that

$$|\mathcal{C}_D| \;=\; \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{H\in\mathcal{H}\\ H\supset D}} H$$

is the union of convex, hence contractible components labelled by the (open) chambers of the quotient arrangement $\mathcal{H}/\mathbb{L}(D)$. Recall that $C_2 \le D$, $\dim(C_2) = 1$ is, by our assumption, a half-line. Therefore for any connected component $U \subset |\mathcal{C}_D|$, the intersection $U \cap |\mathcal{C}_D^{\ge C_2}|$ is a non-empty convex set so it is contractible as well. This proves that $|\mathcal{C}_D^{\ge C_2}| \hookrightarrow |\mathcal{C}_D|$ is a homotopy equivalence and so $\gamma_{[C_1,D],[C_2,D]}$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

E. Inclusions of type (2). To finish the proof of Proposition 8.7, we need to consider elementary inclusions of type (2). We write such an inclusion as $[C_1, D_1] \le [D_2, D_2]$ where D_1, D_2 are two cells of the same dimension M, lying in the same m-dimensional subspace $L = \mathbb{L}(D_!) = \mathbb{L}(D_2)$ on the opposite side of an $(m-1)$-dimensional cell $C_1 \le D_1, D_2$.

The argument runs very similarly to the case of an inclusion of type (1) considered in §D. We indicate the changes, using the same notation as in §D for the intermediate complexes and and treating the grading in these complexes as implicit.

First, the morphism of complexes $\gamma_{C_1,D_1],[D_2,D_2]}$ is surjective with kernel

$$K^\bullet \;=\; \bigoplus_{\substack{C\ge C_1\\ C\not\ge D_2}} E_{C\circ D_1}\otimes \mathrm{or}(C),$$

graded by $\mathrm{codim}(C)$. Second, we have the increasing filtration F in $K^\bullet$ by $\dim(C\circ D_1)$ with quotients that split into direct sum over $M \in \mathcal{L}$ of complexes

$$G_M^\bullet \;=\; \bigoplus_{\substack{C\ge C_1,\, C\not\ge D_2\\ \mathbb{L}(C\circ D_1)=M}} E_{C\circ D_1}\otimes \mathrm{or}(C).$$

So we need to prove that each $G_M^\bullet$ is exact. As in §D, we have $G_M^\bullet = G_1^\bullet/G_2^\bullet$ where $G_1^\bullet$ is the direct sum over $C \ge C_1$ such that $L(C\circ D_1) = M$ (so it

is exactly the same complex as in §D), and $G_2^\bullet$ is the subcomplex formed by $E_{C\circ D_1} \otimes \mathrm{or}(C)$ for $C \geq D_2$. As before, re can and will assume that $C_1 = 0$ and $M = \mathbb{R}^n$. This D_1, D_2 are two opposite half-lines of the same line: $D_2 = -D_1$. So $G_1^\bullet$ is the cellular chain complex of a local system $\mathcal{G}$ on $|\mathcal{C}_{D_1}|$ and $G_2^\bullet$ is the chain complex of $\mathcal{G}$ on $|\mathcal{C}_{D_1}^{\geq D_2}|$. Since $D_2 = -D_1$, the subspace $|\mathcal{C}_{D_1}^{\geq D_2}|$ is again a union of convex connected component, one inside each convex connected component of $|\mathcal{C}_{D_1}|$, so the embedding $G_2^\bullet \hookrightarrow G_1^\bullet$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and Proposition 8.7 is proved.

E. End of the proof of Reformulation 8.2. Given $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ satisfying (Mon), (Tran) and (Inv), we have associated to it an $\mathcal{S}^{(0)}$-constructible complex $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})$ on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Note that the orthogonality relations of Lemma 6.4 apply to the $\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{Q})$ and imply that the linear data of $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})$ are given by $\mathcal{Q}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}$ consists of single vector spaces (not just complexes), Proposition 4.13 implies that $\mathcal{E}^\bullet(\mathcal{Q})$ is a perverse sheaf, with double quiver $\mathcal{Q}$. This proves Reformulation 8.2 and thus Theorem 8.1.

9 Examples and complements

A. The case of dimension 1. Suppose $n = 1$. The real vector space $\mathbb{R}$ has the unique hyperplane $\{0\}$. The arrangement consisting of this hyperplane will be denoted simply by 0. It has three cells $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x > 0\}$, $\mathbb{R}_- = \{x < 0\}$ and $\{0\}$. The category $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ consists of perverse sheaves on $\mathbb{C}$ smooth with respect to the stratification consisting of $\{0\}$ and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. The classical description [14] identifies $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ with the category $\mathcal{P}$ of diagrams of finite-dimensional vector spaces

$$\Phi \underset{u}{\overset{v}{\rightleftarrows}} \Psi\ , \quad vu + \mathrm{Id}_\Psi \text{ invertible.}$$

The spaces Ψ and Φ associated to $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ are canonically identified with the spaces of nearby and vanishing cycles of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the standard coordinate function on $\mathbb{C}$, while $vu + \mathrm{Id}_\Psi$ is the monodromy on the space of nearby cycles, see [1].

On the other hand, our description from Theorem 8.1 identifies $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ with the category $\mathcal{A}$ formed by double representations

$$\mathcal{Q} = \Big\{\ E_- \underset{\delta_-}{\overset{\gamma_-}{\rightleftarrows}} E_0 \underset{\delta_+}{\overset{\gamma_+}{\rightleftarrows}} E_+\ \Big\} \quad \text{such that}$$

$$\gamma_-\delta_- = \mathrm{Id}_{E_-},\ \ \gamma_+\delta_+ = \mathrm{Id}_{E_+},$$

$$\gamma_-\delta_+ : E_+ \longrightarrow E_-,\ \ \gamma_+\delta_- : E_- \to E_+ \quad \text{are invertible.}$$

Let us construct an equivalence between $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ directly. In fact, it is convenient to reformulate the definition of $\mathcal{A}$ slightly. Given $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{A}$, consider endomorphisms

$$P_+ = \delta_+\gamma_+,\ \ P_- = \delta_-\gamma_- \ \ \in \ \ \mathrm{End}(E_0).$$

These endomorphisms are idempotent:

$$P_+^2 \ = \ \delta_+\gamma_+\delta_+\gamma_+ \ = \ \delta_+ \,\mathrm{Id}\, \gamma_+ \ = \ \delta_+\gamma_+ \ = \ P_+,$$

and similarly for P_-. The spaces $E_\pm$ are identified with $\mathrm{Im}(P_\pm)$ via $\delta_\pm$. The conditions of invertibility of $\gamma_\pm\delta_\mp$ is expressed by:

$$\text{(9.1)} \qquad \begin{cases} P_- : \mathrm{Im}(P_+) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Im}(P_-), \\ P_+ : \mathrm{Im}(P_-) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Im}(P_+) \end{cases} \qquad \text{are isomorphisms.}$$

This establishes the following.

Lemma 9.2. *The category $\mathcal{A}$ is equivalent to the category $\mathcal{B}$ formed by data (E_0, P_+, P_-) consisting of a finite-dimensional* $\mathbf{k}$*-vector space E_0 and two idempotents $P_+, P_- : E_0 \to E_0$ satisfying* (9.1). □

So we will construct an equivalence $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathcal{P}$. Given $(E_0, P_+, P_-) \in \mathcal{B}$, we put

$$\Phi := \mathrm{Ker}(P_-) \underset{u=P_- - \mathrm{Id}}{\overset{v=P_+}{\rightleftarrows}} \Psi := \mathrm{Im}(P_+).$$

Then $vu = P_+(P_- - \mathrm{Id})$ is, as an endomorphism of $\mathrm{Im}(P_+)$, equal to $P_+P_- - P_+$. Now, on $\mathrm{Im}(P_+)$ we have $P_+ = \mathrm{Id}$. So $vu + \mathrm{Id} = P_+P_-$ as an endomorphism of $\mathrm{Im}(P_+)$ and so it is the composition of two invertible maps

$$\mathrm{Im}(P_+) \xrightarrow{P_-} \mathrm{Im}(P_-) \xrightarrow{P_+} \mathrm{Im}(P_+)$$

and hence invertible. This defines a functor $F : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{P}$. Note that the two maps above have the meaning of half-monodromies from the upper to the lower half plane, so $vu + \mathrm{Id}$ is the full monodromy.

Let us also define the functor $G : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{B}$ as follows. Given an object $\{ \Phi \underset{u}{\overset{v}{\rightleftarrows}} \Psi \} \in \mathcal{P}$, we put

$$E_0 = \Phi \oplus \Psi, \quad P_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ v & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{9.3}$$

Then $P_\pm$ are idempotents.

Proposition 9.4. *The functors F and G are quasi-inverse to each other.*

Proof: Let us find GF. For $P_\pm$ defined above, we have

$$\mathrm{Im}(P_+) = \Psi, \quad \mathrm{Ker}(P_+) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \phi \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} \,\middle|\, v\phi + \psi = 0 \right\} \;=\; \text{Graph of } (-v) : \Phi \to \Psi,$$
$$\mathrm{Im}(P_-) = \text{Graph of } u : \Psi \to \Psi, \quad \mathrm{Ker}(P_-) = \Phi.$$

The map $P_+ : \mathrm{Ker}(P_-) \to \mathrm{Im}(P_+)$ coincides with v. Further, $P_- - \mathrm{Id}$ restricted to$\Psi \subset \Phi \oplus \Psi$ gives $u : \Psi \to \Phi$. Therefore GF is isomorphic to the identify functor of $\mathcal{P}$.

Conversely, suppose $(E_0, P_+, P_-) \in \mathcal{B}$. We then have two direct sum decompositions of E_0:

$$E_0 \;=\; \Phi \oplus \mathrm{Im}(P_-) \;=\; \mathrm{Ker}(P_+) \oplus \Psi.$$

The condition that $P_- : \mathrm{Im}(P_+) \to \mathrm{Im}(P_-)$ is an isomorphism, implies that $\mathrm{Im}(P_+) \cap \mathrm{Ker}(P_-) = 0$ which, by the dimension count implies that we have a direct sum decomposition

$$E_0 \;=\; \mathrm{Im}(P_+) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(P_-) \;=\; \Psi \oplus \Phi.$$

With respect to this decomposition, we find that $P_\pm$ are given by the matrices in (9.3). So FG is isomorphic to the identity functor of $\mathcal{B}$. □

Remark 9.5. In addition to the above equivalence which we denote here $F_+ : \mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{P}$ there exists another one $F_- : \mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{P}$ where for $x = (E_0, P_+, P_-) \in \mathcal{B}$ we set

$$F_-(x) = \Big\{\ \Phi := \mathrm{Ker}(P_+) \underset{u=P_+-\mathrm{Id}}{\overset{v=P_-}{\rightleftarrows}} \Psi := \mathrm{Im}(P_-)\ \Big\}$$

Furthermore, there are two invertible natural transformations ("half-monodromies") $t_\pm : F_\pm \xrightarrow{\sim} F_\mp$ given by

$$t_+(x) = (P_+ - \mathrm{Id}, P_-) :\ F_+(x) \xrightarrow{\sim} F_-(x)$$

and

$$t_-(x) = (P_- - \mathrm{Id}, P_+) :\ F_-(x) \xrightarrow{\sim} F_+(x)$$

These data define a $\mathbb{C}^*$-local system of equivalences $\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{P}$; this is a particular case of the *microlocalization*, similar to [13].

Finally, let us describe the effect of the geometric Fourier transform $\mathfrak{F} : \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0) \to \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ in terms of our description. In the classical description, as well known,

$$\mathfrak{F}\{\ \Phi \underset{u}{\overset{v}{\rightleftarrows}} \Psi\ \} \;\simeq\; \{\ \Psi \underset{v}{\overset{u}{\rightleftarrows}} \Phi\ \}$$

We leave to the reader the verification of the following.

Proposition 9.6. *In terms of the identification* $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0) \simeq \mathcal{B}$*,*

$$\mathfrak{F}(E_0, P_1, P_2) \;\simeq\; (E_0, 1 - P_1, 1 - P_2),$$

and in terms of the identification $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}, 0) \simeq \mathcal{A}$*,*

$$\mathfrak{F}\Big\{\ E_- \underset{\delta_-}{\overset{\gamma_-}{\rightleftarrows}} E_0 \underset{\delta_+}{\overset{\gamma_+}{\rightleftarrows}} E_+\ \Big\} \;\simeq\; \Big\{\ \mathrm{Ker}(\gamma_-) \underset{\textit{embedding}}{\overset{\mathrm{Id}-\delta_-\gamma_-}{\rightleftarrows}} E_0 \underset{\textit{embedding}}{\overset{\mathrm{Id}-\delta_+\gamma_+}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathrm{Ker}(\gamma_+)\ \Big\}.$$

□

B. Real affine arrangements. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an arrangement of *affine* hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the complexified arrangement of affine hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}^n$. We have then the category $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{H}$-smooth perverse sheaves on $\mathbb{C}^n$, similarly to the case of linear arrangements.

Such categories are important for the geometric description of tensor structures on the categories of quantum group representations, [3].

Theorem 8.1 is extended to this case as follows. We have the poset of faces $(\mathcal{C}, \leq)$, defined similarly to the linear case. A triple of faces (A, B, C) is called *collinear*, if:

(C1) There exists a face $D \leq A, B, C$.

(C2) There exists points $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$ such that $b \in [a, c]$.

The condition (C1) holds automatically in the linear case (take $D = 0$). As with any poset, we have the category $\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ of double representations $\mathcal{Q} = (E_c, \gamma_{C'C}, \delta_{CC'})$ of $\mathcal{C}$.

The condition of *monotonicity* on $\mathcal{Q}$ is defined just as in the linear case: $\gamma_{C'C}\delta_{CC'} = \mathrm{Id}$ for any $C' \leq C$. This allows us to define the transition maps $\phi_{AB} = \gamma_{CB}\delta_{AC} : E_A \to E_B$ for any two faces A, B such that there is a face $C \leq A, B$.

The condition of *transitivity* is defined by requiring that $\phi_{AC} = \phi_{BC}\phi_{AB}$ for any triple of cases (A, B, C) collinear in the new sense above.

Finally, the condition of *invertibility* of $\mathcal{Q}$ is defined completely similarly to the linear case.

We denote by $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$ the full subcategory in $\mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C})$ formed by $\mathcal{Q}$ which are monotone, transitive and invertible.

Theorem 9.7. *The category* $\mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}})$ *is equivalent to* $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof: Locally (in a neighborhood of any point of $\mathbb{R}^n$), an affine arrangement looks like a linear one. Therefore, applying known properties of the linear case, we establish the following statements:

(1) For $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H})$ the complex $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}} = \underline{R\Gamma}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathcal{F})[n]$ is reduced to one sheaf in degree 0, constructible with respect to the (cellular) stratification $\mathcal{C}$

(2) Denoting by $E_C(\mathcal{F})$ the stalk of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}}$ at $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we have a canonical identification $\mathcal{E}_C(\mathcal{F}^\bigstar) = E_C(\mathcal{F})^*$.

(3) Denoting $\gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{C'C} : E_{C'}(\mathcal{F}) \to E_C(\mathcal{F})$, $C' \leq C$, the generalization maps for $\mathcal{R}_F$, and putting $\delta^{\mathcal{F}}_{CC'} = (\gamma^{\mathcal{F}^\star}_{C'C})^*$, we get an object

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \big(E_C(\mathcal{F}),\, \gamma^{\mathcal{F}}_{C'C},\, \delta^{\mathcal{F}}_{CC'}\big) \;\in\; \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C}).$$

This object lies in $\mathcal{A}$.

We get therefore a functor $\mathfrak{Q} : \mathrm{Perv}(\mathbb{C}^n, \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}) \to \mathcal{A}$ taking $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{F})$. To prove that it is an equivalence, we use the fact that perverse sheaves form a stack. That is, we upgrade $\mathfrak{Q}$ to a morphism of stacks of abelian categories on $\mathbb{R}^n$

$$\underline{\mathfrak{Q}} : \underline{\mathrm{Perv}}_{(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathcal{H})} \longrightarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}}$$

defined as follows. For an open $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the category $\underline{\mathrm{Perv}}_{(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathcal{H})}(U)$ consists of perverse sheaves on $U + i\mathbb{R}^n$ smooth with respect to the stratification cut out on $U + i\mathbb{R}^n$ by $\mathcal{H}$. We further denote by $\mathcal{C}_U \subset \mathcal{C}$ the subset of faces meeting U and extend the concept of collinearity to $\mathcal{C}_U$ be requiring in (C2) that $D \in \mathcal{C}_U$. Then we define $\underline{\mathcal{A}}(U) \subset \mathrm{Rep}^{(2)}(\mathcal{C}_U)$ to be the full subcategory specified by the conditions of monotonicity, transitivity and invertibility. The same arguments as before define a functor $\underline{\mathfrak{Q}}(U) : \underline{\mathrm{Perv}}_{(\mathbb{C}^n,\mathcal{H})}(U) \to \underline{\mathcal{A}}(U)$, and these functors unite into a morphism of stacks $\underline{\mathfrak{Q}}$. Note that $\mathfrak{Q}$ is obtained from $\underline{\mathfrak{Q}}$ by passing to the categories of global sections. So it is enough to show that $\underline{\mathfrak{Q}}$ is an equivalence of stacks, a statement that can be checked locally, at the level of stalks. But the stalk functor of $\underline{\mathfrak{Q}}$ over any point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a similar functor $\mathfrak{Q}$ for the (essentially) linear configuration formed by hyperplanes from $\mathcal{H}$ containing x. So it is an equivalence by Theorem 8.1. □

The method of using the stacky nature of perverse sheaves to obtain descriptions in new situations was applied by Dupont to the case of smooth toric varieties [12].

References

[1] A. Beilinson. How to glue perverse sheaves. In: K-theory, arithmetic and geometry (Moscow, 1984), *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1289**, Springer-Verlag, 1987, 42 - 51.

[2] A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, P. Deligne. Faisceaux Pervers. *Astérisque* **100**.

[3] R. Bezrukavnikov, M. Finkelberg, V. Schechtman. *Factorizable Sheaves and Quantum Groups. Lecture Notes in Math.* **1691**, Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[4] A. Björner, M. Las Vergnas, B. Sturmfels, N. White, G. Ziegler. *Oriented Matroids*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.

[5] A. Björner, G. Ziegler. Combinatorial stratification of complex arrangements. *Jour. AMS*, **5** (1992), 105-149.

[6] T. Braden. Perverse sheaves on Grassmannians. *Canad. J. Math.* **54** (2002) 493-532.

[7] T. Braden. Hyperbolic localization of intersection cohomology, *Transform. groups* , **8** (2003), 209-216.

[8] T. Braden, M. Grinberg. Perverse sheaves on rank stratifications. *Duke Math. J.* **96** (1999) 317-362.

[9] K. Brown, P. Diaconis, Random walks and hyperplane arrangements, *Ann. Prob.* **26** (1998), 1813 - 1854.

[10] J. Curry. Sheaves, Cosheaves and Applications. arXiv:1303.3255.

[11] V. Drinfeld, D. Gaitsgory. On a theorem of Braden. arXiv:1308.3786.

[12] D. Dupont. Faisceaux pervers sur les variétés toriques lisses. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, **348** (2010), 853-856.

[13] M. Finkelberg, V. Schechtman, Microlocal approach to Lusztig's symmetries, arXiv:1401.5885.

[14] A. Galligo, M. Granger, Ph. Maisonobe. D-modules et faisceaux pervers dont le support singulier est un croisement normal. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **35** (1985), 1-48.

[15] S. Gelfand, R. D. MacPherson. Verma modules and Schubert cells: a dictionary. in: *"Paul Dubreil and Marie-Paule Malliavin Algebra Seminar", 34th Year (Paris, 1981)*, pp. 1-50. Lecture Notes in Math. **924**, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1982.

[16] I. M. Gelfand, G. L. Rybnikov. Algebraic and topological invariants of oriented matroids *Sov. Math. Dokl.,* **40** (1990), 148-152.

[17] S. Gelfand, R. D. McPherson, K. Vilonen, Microlocal perverse sheaves, arXiv:math/0509440.

[18] S. I. Gelfand, Y. I. Manin. *Methods of Homological Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.

[19] S. G. Gindikin, F. I. Karpelevich, On an integral connected with symmetric spaces of nonpositive curvature, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, Ser. Math. **30** (1966), 1147 - 1156.

[20] N. Honda, P. Schapira. A vanishing theorem for holonomic modules with positive characteristic varieties. *Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ.* **26** (1990), 529-534.

[21] M. Kashiwara. Algebraic study of systems of partial differential equations. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr.* **63** (1995), 1-72.

[22] M. Kashiwara. The Riemann-Hilbert Problem for Holonomic Systems. *Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ.* **20** (1984), 319-365.

[23] M. Kashiwara, P. Schapira. Sheaves on Manifolds. Springer, 1990.

[24] A. W. Knapp, The Gindikin - Karpelevich formula and intertwining operators. In: S.Gindikin, ed. Lie groups and symmetric spaces. In memory of F.I. Karpelevich, *AMS Transl.* **210** (2003), 145 - 159.

[25] H. Komatsu. On the index of ordinary differential operators. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. 1A Math.* **18** (1971), 379-398.

[26] G. Lebeau. Annulation de la cohomologie hyperfonction de certains modules holonomes. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. A,* t.**290** (1980), 313-316.

[27] R. D. McPherson, K. Vilonen. Elementary constructions of perverse sheaves. *Invent. Math.* **84** (1986), 403 - 435.

[28] Y. I. Manin, V. V. Schechtman. Arrangements of real hyperplanes and Zamolodchikov equations. Group theoretical methods in physics, Vol. I (Yurmala, 1985), 151-165, VNU Sci. Press, Utrecht, 1986.

[29] C. Moeglin, J.-L. Waldspurger, *Décomposition spectrale et séries d'Eisenstein. Une paraphrase de l'Écriture*, Progress in Mathematics **113**, Birkhäuser, 1995.

[30] A. Polishchuk. Perverse sheaves on a triangulated space. *Math. Res. Lett.* **4** (1997), 191-199.

[31] M. Salvetti. Topology of the complement of real hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}^n$. *Invent. Math.* **88** (1987), 603-618.

[32] M. Sato. T. Kawai, M. Kashiwara. Microfunctions and pseudo-differential equations, in: H.Komatsu, ed., Hyperfunctions and pseudo-differential equations, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **287** (1973), 265 - 529.

[33] V. V. Schechtman, A. N. Varchenko. Arrangements of hyperplanes and Lie algebra homology. *Invent. Math.* **106** (1991), 139-194.

[34] V. V. Schechtman, A. N. Varchenko. Quantum groups and homology of local systems. In: Algebraic Geometry and Analytic Geometry (Tokyo 1990), Springer-Verlag, 1991, 182-191.

[35] G. Schiffmann, Intégrales d'entrelacement et fonctions de Whittaker. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **99** (1971), 3 - 72.

[36] J. Schürmann. On the dimension formula for hyperfunction solutions of some holonomic $\mathcal{D}$-modules. *Publ. RIMS. Kyoto Univ.* **42** (2006), 1-8.

[37] K. Takeuchi, Dimension formula for hyperfunction solutions to holonomic $\mathcal{D}$-modules, *Adv. Math.* **180** (2003), 134-145.

[38] J. Tits, Buildings of spherical type and finite BN-pairs, *Lect. Notes in Math.* **386**, 1974.

[39] A. Varchenko. Multidimensional Hypergeometric Functions and Representation Theory of Lie Algebras and Quantum Groups. World Scientific, Singapore, 1995.

[40] J.-L. Verdier. Dualité dans la cohomologie des espaces localement compacts. *Sém. Bourbaki*, **300**, 1965-66.

[41] M. Vybornov. Mixed algebras and quivers related to cell complexes. *Comm. Algebra* **25** (1997), 3985-3992.

[42] M. Vybornov. Constructible sheaves on simplicial complexes and Koszul duality. *Math. Res. Lett.* **5** (1998), 675-683.

M.K.: Department of Mathematics, Yale University, New Haven CT 06520 USA, mikhail.kapranov@yale.edu

V.S.: Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, Université Paul Sabatier, 118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse, France,
schechtman@math.ups-tlse.fr